



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **105th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1997

No. 156

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PEASE].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 8, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the scriptures we read what is required of us, and that is, to do what is just, to love mercy, and to live in humble fellowship with You, our God and our creator. So let us by Your grace, O God, keep this requirement at the center of our thoughts and at the heart of our prayers so that we will be the people You would have us be. We know too that as we attempt to walk the road of justice while hearing the various claims for truth, we are supported by Your promises which we read in the book of Psalms: "Be of good courage and he shall strengthen your heart, all you that trust in God." Bless us this day and every day we pray, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

NOTICE

Under the Rules for Publication of the Congressional Record, a final issue of the Congressional Record for the first session of the 105th Congress will be published on **(the 31st day after adjournment)**, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-60 or ST-41 of the Capitol), no later than 10 days following adjournment. Office hours of the Official Reporters of Debates are 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Monday through Friday through **(the 10th day after adjournment)**.

The final issue will be dated **(the 31st day after adjournment)** and will be delivered on **(the 33d day after adjournment)**.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event, that occurred after the adjournment date.

Members' statements also should be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates **(insert e-mail address for each office)**.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

JOHN WARNER, *Chairman.*

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H10349

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 56, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 616]

YEAS—345

Ackerman	Engel	Lewis (CA)
Aderholt	Eshoo	Lewis (KY)
Allen	Etheridge	Linder
Andrews	Evans	Lipinski
Armey	Ewing	Livingston
Bachus	Farr	Lofgren
Baesler	Fawell	Lowey
Baker	Flake	Lucas
Ballenger	Foley	Luther
Barcia	Forbes	Maloney (CT)
Barr	Ford	Manton
Barrett (NE)	Fossella	Manzullo
Barrett (WI)	Fowler	Martinez
Bartlett	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Matsui
Bass	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)
Bateman	Frost	McCarthy (NY)
Bentsen	Furse	McCollum
Berman	Galleghy	McCrery
Berry	Ganske	McGovern
Billirakis	Gejdenson	McHale
Bishop	Gekas	McHugh
Blagojevich	Gibbons	McInnis
Bliley	Gilchrest	McIntyre
Blunt	Gilman	McKeon
Boehlert	Goode	McKinney
Boehner	Goodlatte	Meehan
Bonilla	Goodling	Metcalfe
Bono	Gordon	Mica
Boswell	Goss	Millender-
Boucher	Graham	McDonald
Boyd	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brady	Green	Minge
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Mink
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Bunning	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Burr	Hamilton	Moran (KS)
Burton	Hansen	Moran (VA)
Buyer	Hastert	Morella
Callahan	Hastings (WA)	Murtha
Calvert	Hayworth	Myrick
Camp	Hefner	Nadler
Campbell	Herger	Neal
Canady	Hilleary	Nethercutt
Cannon	Hinojosa	Ney
Cardin	Hobson	Northup
Carson	Holden	Norwood
Chabot	Hooley	Nussle
Chambliss	Horn	Obey
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Olver
Christensen	Houghton	Ortiz
Clayton	Hoyer	Owens
Clement	Hunter	Oxley
Coble	Hutchinson	Packard
Coburn	Hyde	Pappas
Collins	Inglis	Parker
Combest	Istook	Pastor
Condit	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Paxon
Cook	(TX)	Payne
Cooksey	Jefferson	Pease
Coyne	Jenkins	Pelosi
Cramer	John	Peterson (MN)
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Petri
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
Cunningham	Jones	Pitts
Danner	Kanjorski	Pombo
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Kasich	Porter
Davis (VA)	Kelly	Portman
Deal	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
DeGette	Kennelly	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kildee	Pryce (OH)
DeLay	Kilpatrick	Radanovich
Dellums	Kim	Rahall
Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Redmond
Dicks	Kleczka	Regula
Dingell	Klink	Reyes
Dixon	Knollenberg	Riggs
Doggett	Kolbe	Rivers
Dooley	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Doolittle	LaHood	Roemer
Doyle	Lampson	Rogan
Dreier	Lantos	Rogers
Duncan	Largent	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Latham	Roh-Lehtinen
Edwards	LaTourette	Roukema
Ehlers	Lazio	Roybal-Allard
Ehrlich	Leach	Royce
Emerson	Levin	Rush

Ryun	Smith (NJ)
Salmon	Smith (OR)
Sanchez	Smith (TX)
Sanders	Smith, Adam
Sandlin	Smith, Linda
Sanford	Snowbarger
Sawyer	Snyder
Saxton	Solomon
Scarborough	Souder
Schaefer, Dan	Spence
Schumer	Stark
Sensenbrenner	Stearns
Serrano	Stenholm
Shadegg	Stokes
Shays	Stump
Sherman	Sununu
Shimkus	Talent
Shuster	Tanner
Sisisky	Tauscher
Skaggs	Tauzin
Skeen	Thomas
Skelton	Thornberry
Slaughter	Thune
Smith (MI)	Thurman

NAYS—56

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Pallone
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Becerra	Gutknecht	Pickett
Billbray	Hastings (FL)	Ramstad
Bonior	Hefley	Sabo
Borski	Hill	Schaffer, Bob
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Scott
Brown (OH)	Hulshof	Sessions
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Spratt
Clyburn	Kingston	Strickland
DeFazio	Kucinich	Stupak
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	LoBiondo	Thompson
English	Markey	Velazquez
Ensign	McNulty	Visclosky
Everett	Meek	Waters
Fazio	Menendez	Weller
Filner	Miller (CA)	Yates
Fox	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—32

Archer	Harman	Riley
Bereuter	Hinche	Rothman
Blumenauer	Hoekstra	Schiff
Castle	Kennedy (MA)	Shaw
Costello	Klug	Stabenow
Cox	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (NC)
Cubin	McDade	Torres
Fattah	McDermott	Walsh
Foglietta	McIntosh	Weygand
Gillmor	Neumann	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Quinn	

□ 1232

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SOUDER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SOLOMON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1747. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize the design

and construction of additions to the parking garage and certain site improvements, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1377. An act to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to encourage retirement income savings.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 170. An act to provide for a process to authorize the use of clone pagers, and for other purposes;

S. 1079. An act to permit the mineral leasing of Indian land located within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in any case in which there is consent from a majority interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease;

S. 1417. An act to provide for the design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a Center for Performing Arts within the complex known as the New Mexico Hispanic Cultural Center and for other purposes.

S. 1455. An act to provide financial assistance for the relocation and expansion of Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology, Providence, Rhode Island.

S. 1456. An act to authorize an interpretive center at Fort Peck Dam, Montana; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding proliferation of missile technology from Russia to Iran.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-56, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals as members of the Panel to Review Long-Range Air Power: Samuel D. Adcock, of Virginia, and Merrill A. McPeak, of Oregon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize ten 1-minutes on each side of the House.

ALLEGED WRONGDOINGS OF SECRETARY BABBITT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve the truth and they deserve an answer. Did the Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt wield political power in exchange for the promise of a campaign contribution? Did the order to do so come from the White House? These are very serious questions that the American people deserve to have answered.

Well, let us ask Secretary Babbitt. First he says, "No." Then he says, "Yes, I did it, but I was only doing as I was told." Now the answer approved by the White House is, "I don't know." Well, how many scandals and how

many allegations of criminal wrongdoing will the executive branch of this Government respond to with, "I don't know"? Well, maybe this Congress should instruct the Centers for Disease Control to investigate the rampant selective loss of memory in this administration.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am here to say enough is enough. American people deserve the truth. I urge Attorney General Reno to appoint an independent counsel to investigate the alleged wrongdoings of Secretary Bruce Babitt.

VOTE AGAINST FAST TRACK

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against giving the President fast track authority in order to ensure that new trade agreements advance the interests of U.S. workers as well as the health and safety of all Americans.

My opposition to fast track is based on our experience with NAFTA, which I believe has been a dismal failure. In 3 years since NAFTA was implemented, the U.S. trade deficit with Mexico has skyrocketed, leading to the loss of hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs. Environmental problems along the border with Mexico have gotten worse. Drug trafficking has increased. The public health in the United States has been threatened by the importation of tainted food.

The President made all kinds of promises with NAFTA a few years ago and is making more promises now. But these promises in the form of NAFTA side agreements on the environment and labor have not been kept. I urge my colleagues to vote against fast track. Do not be led astray by false promises again.

MIDDLE-CLASS TAXPAYERS NEED IRA EXPANSION

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on a number of previous occasions on the need to expand IRA accounts. Today I would like to cite the need for middle-class parents to save for college education as an important reason for further IRA expansion.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill to expand IRA income caps and deductions to permit penalty-free withdrawals for a number of purposes, including college education. And I am very pleased that the tax bill we passed last summer lifted some of the income caps to benefit more middle-income families.

Although good progress has been made in the expansion of IRA eligibility for college expenses, much more is needed. The main problem is that

IRA deduction ceilings remain, and have remained so for some decades, at \$2,000. It is inadequate. The solution is to increase IRA deduction. My legislation would increase it \$500 annually for 10 years, ending up with a \$7,000 cap. Perhaps a more aggressive schedule could even be kept and it would be possible if current budget trends do result in a budget surplus.

GLOBAL CORPORATE TRADE THREATENS NATIONAL SOV- EREIGNTY

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to give away our national sovereignty in the name of global corporate trade. Fast track legislation furthers the role of the World Trade Organization, an intertribunal of unelected, unaccountable trade experts with the authority to overrule the U.S. Congress, to overrule our national, State, and local laws. The WTO can overrule laws which include job creation legislation, consumer health and safety protections, and environmental protections.

The fast track vote is a vote on the preservation of our national sovereignty, our ability to determine our own destiny. Fast track is an assault on our American political traditions and foundations. It establishes the right of the citizenry to have democratically elected officials be able to make the laws here and the standards we live by.

Fast track gives the World Trade Organization the right to overrule this Congress. We begin these sessions of Congress with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and to the country for which it stands. And if we are to remain one Nation, under God, indivisible, we must stand for liberty and justice and we must reject fast track.

UNITED STATES IS EXPORTING JOBS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, while we are playing around with fast track, our neighbors to the north are eating our economic lunch and stealing our job growth. Let me give my colleagues a couple quotes, first from the Washington Post. "Because of a recent free-trade pact between Canada and Chile that lowered tariffs between the two countries, Caterpillar is beginning to lose sales in Chile to a small Canadian competitor."

"If Caterpillar finds that it is seriously disadvantaged in Latin America by the absence of free-trade agreements, the company would consider shifting production out of the United States and into the region, or to places such as Canada or Mexico that already

have duty-free arrangements with much of Latin America."

Some other U.S. companies are investigating whether their Canadian subsidiaries and plants should now handle their business with Chile in order to profit from tariff breaks.

Ford Motor Co. says it is beginning to examine the feasibility of shipping its popular F-series pickup trucks to Chile from Canada. More than 50 Canadian-Chilean joint ventures are already operating, and some of those are already shipping to other Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, as the AFL-CIO sticks its head in the sand, we are exporting jobs.

FAST TRACK SHIPS JOBS OVERSEAS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to fast track. When American workers are serving Mexican tomatoes and Canadian beef at Burger King and Bob Evans, something is very wrong. The American workers are not dumb. They are fed up, they are sick and tired of unemployment compensation, sick and tired of retraining, sick and tired of promises. They are sick and tired of politics. They are busted, disgusted, and cannot be trusted to vote for cerebral politicians who continue to ship their jobs overseas.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I listened to all this "bridge to the 21st century" business. I say the bridge to the 21st century is turning into another bridge over the River Kwai. Beam me up. Bridge this, Mr. President.

□ 1245

SUPPORT H.R. 1129, MICROCREDIT FOR SELF-RELIANCE ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House today to support H.R. 1129, the Microcredit for Self-Reliance Act which is up on suspension today. Microcredit is one of the universally recognized U.S. programs that has produced incredibly significant and positive results. This bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] will continue the great work that has been done using this economic assistance plan.

Microcredit provides small loans to people who want to start a business but would not be able to secure normal financing. It has worked well in Africa where it has been successfully used in many countries. It is especially effective in promoting women's rights and family development. I would also like

to recognize our own U.S. microcredit programs initiated by groups like Results of Miami, which has helped so many young women start their own businesses.

Minorities in the United States benefit greatly from microcredit programs. In my hometown of Miami, Jamaican-Americans have started Caribbean food product stores, Haitians have opened acrylic nail shops which are so popular, Cuban-Americans have set up mom and pop hardware stores. It has been a success in Miami. It can succeed in your town, and we can export it across the oceans.

HANDSHAKES DEFEAT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM 1-0

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1995 in a very famous handshake, the President and the Speaker of this House shook hands and committed themselves to campaign finance reform. I can speak since then on the commitment of our President to campaign finance reform. I know he would support that bill because in Arkansas he took it to the streets to get signatures on campaign finance reform for Arkansas and was successful.

What has happened since then? Nothing. We have had no bills come to the floor of this House for a vote. Here we are halfway through the session at the end of the year, we are going to adjourn probably tomorrow and what is the final score, Mr. Speaker? The final score is handshakes 1, campaign finance reform nothing. That is a poor record for this Congress. It is a poor record for the Republican leadership of this Congress. Next year we need to do better.

IRS REFORM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, polls have shown that the American people no longer trust their government to do, quote-unquote, the right thing most of the time. In fact, just over the last 3 decades this country has changed so dramatically in that regard. Under President John F. Kennedy, approximately 7 out of 10 Americans trusted their government. Now only 1 out of 10 Americans do. Only 1 out of 10 Americans trust their government to any degree of satisfaction. This is deeply disturbing. I think restoring trust in government must be a top priority for this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the corruption, the politicization and the general abuse of the IRS plays a major role in this change of attitude on the part of the American citizens. When a government agency has the power to bully citizens, to operate with vir-

tually no accountability and to make a mockery of our constitutional right to due process, it is no wonder that the citizens have grown to distrust their own government. I believe that if IRS reform is not passed in this Congress, many Americans will consider the 105th Congress to be an overall failure.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House should oppose fast track because of labor standards, environmental standards and human rights. But there is another very valid reason, that of food safety and pesticide use in foreign countries on food coming into this country.

Since the last fast track legislation, NAFTA, it limited our right to make border inspections of imported food. So what has happened? Food imports are up, inspections are down. What will happen with this new fast track deal is more countries will be shipping their food into this country. We have not addressed the infrastructure to provide a safety net to protect American citizens from food coming into this country. That is why in 1997 we have had 3 major outbreaks of disease in this country from imported food.

What do they tell you when you go to foreign countries, Latin America and South America? Do not eat the food, do not drink this, do this, get a hepatitis shot. So what are we going to do? Have more food come into this country and less inspections. Over 3.3 million trucks every day cross our borders into this country, many of them carrying food products. That is 9,000 trucks per day. One percent is inspected. Let us not risk our families' health. Vote no on fast track.

TAXES, LIBERALS AND BUREAUCRATS

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clinton's recent remarks that he thinks taxpayers who are in favor of tax cuts are selfish is a truly stunning remark to me. It is stunning to think that that is how the President and his liberal allies think about those who think that Government can get by on a little bit less so that families can have a little bit more. But one point that is often missed about the tax dollars that are sent to Washington, DC, is the much more fundamental point of who gets to spend your dollars. The liberal elite is uncomfortable with the idea that you should get to decide what to do with your money. They think that the politicians who claim to adhere to a higher moral standard have a higher claim on your money and that they can use your money in better ways than

you can and more fairly and more in line with the liberal vision of the elite. That is why they have a government knows best attitude and, incredibly, a boundless faith in the Federal bureaucrats in Washington to do the right thing.

Do the right thing? Mr. Speaker, I do not think so.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will vote on fast track, expanding the North American Free Trade Agreement to dozens of other countries. NAFTA cost tens of thousands of American jobs. So does fast track. NAFTA threatens the safety of our food supply. So does fast track. NAFTA weakens our environmental laws. So does fast track.

To get fast track through Congress, Speaker GINGRICH and President Clinton are wheeling and dealing like we have never seen before: deals on the census, on family planning, on health care and campaign contributions. Let us reject the wheeling and dealing by Speaker GINGRICH and President Clinton. Vote no on fast track.

IRS REFORM

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, for years citizens have been complaining about the IRS. Honest citizens faced with an audit, a problem, confusing changes in the Tax Code and bewildering instructions about their tax return have cried out for reform to their representatives in Washington, radio talk show hosts and newspapers across the country. But nothing seems to change. To add insult to injury, the IRS responds to all these complaints by defending its actions, assuring citizens everywhere that the IRS is improving, the IRS is reforming itself and honest taxpayers have nothing to fear from an audit. If this is not the perfect example of an arrogant bureaucracy that is out of touch, I would like to see a better one. Arrogant, out of touch and unaccountable, these are the hallmarks of a Government that abuses its power, a Government which makes ordinary citizens feel powerless and fearful.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS must change big time, not cosmetic changes that mean business as usual but a top-to-bottom overhaul that does not put honest taxpayers in the same boat as tax cheats. The IRS needs to give taxpayers the respect they deserve.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are watching the proceedings that are happening in this Chamber this weekend, because if they watch what they will see is a monumental battle being fought out between a Democratic administration in conjunction with the Republican leadership versus the working class American family. The multinational corporations, with the support of our Democratic President and our Republican leadership, are taking sides against America's working families. How are they doing this? They are cutting deals that in my judgment are shameful. They are contributing to the cynicism that Americans feel about what happens in this Chamber.

We are supposed to come here, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the people, to vote on the basis of principle, to follow our own conscience, and to do what we believe in our heart is best for our constituents. But this weekend multinational corporations in conjunction with a Democratic President and a Republican leadership are selling out the American people.

CAN PUBLIC OFFICIALS BEHAVING IN UNETHICAL MANNER BE TRUSTED WITH NEW LAW?

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, when was the last time you heard the argument that changing the law or passing a new law will make people who break the law honest? Well, yesterday, if you count what we hear in this Chamber. The fact is the DNC, friends of the White House, and close aides in this administration have been caught red-handed doing things that they know are illegal: Taking foreign money, laundering money, laundering union money, raising money on Government property, shaking down Indian tribes for money, raising money at Buddhist temples, covering for political operatives who have fled from this country, selling the Commerce Department trade missions, selling access to the White House and on and on. All these things are wrong, they are illegal, and they are dishonest.

My suspicion is that the same people who have been caught behaving in an unethical, illegal, and dishonest manner are not going to suddenly become public officials who can be trusted with a new law. What do you think?

MONEY BELONGS TO THOSE WHO EARN IT

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President called taxpayers selfish for wanting to keep more of what they

earn. Recently the Democrat leader in the Senate, TOM DASCHLE, said that Americans were not overtaxed. The President's deputy press secretary said that support of tax relief was based on selfishness.

Stop the presses, Mr. Speaker. To say that people are shocked would be an understatement. Claiming that most people are undertaxed and calling Americans selfish is exactly the kind of mindset that make people furious at Washington, DC politicians who just do not get it.

I have a news flash for them. When people work hard to earn more, they are not doing it for Washington. They are doing it to feed their children, enrich their lives and pursue their own happiness. This is the way it should be. Why do the defenders of big government and the status quo have such a problem with it? They are in Washington to represent their constituents, not tell them how much of their own money they can keep.

Americans are overtaxed. The Tax Foundation found that Americans spend more on taxes than food, shelter, and clothing combined.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded not to refer to statements by Members of the other body during remarks in this Chamber.

PRIVATE GOLF CLUBS USE TAX LOOPHOLE TO PRACTICE DISCRIMINATION

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress did a great service for this Nation by passing the Internal Revenue Service reform legislation. However, in our celebration, I must inform my colleagues that there is more work that needs to be done. We must eliminate a little known tax loophole for private clubs that profit from practicing discrimination.

This chart details four private golf clubs identified by HBO's "Real Sport with Bryant Gumbel." They have \$9 million in taxpayers funds while excluding African-Americans. Each year these 501(c)(7) clubs act as nonprofit organizations that are exempt from paying corporate taxes to the Federal Government.

□ 1300

This is just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Speaker. I am offering legislation today that will end this, and I hope the Members of this body will join me.

IT IS UNFAIR TO FORCE PARENTS TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO BAD SCHOOLS

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, last week, right on this House floor, I was disappointed to hear a distinguished Member of the other side of the aisle say that education savings accounts and school choice would operate at the expense of public schools. I would like to respond to that accusation. The key point is this:

We believe absolutely, based on 200 years of evidence, that competition forces excellence, it forces improvement in quality, and it forces innovation. In many parts of our country it is very important to improve the public school system.

Second, we believe it is unfair to force parents who love their children to send them to a bad school simply because they cannot afford to send them someplace else.

While some continue to defend failed schools and ask for more money and create more Washington Federal programs, we have a better idea. We favor giving parents more choice. Now, some parents have unlimited choices as to where they can send their children to school, but some do not. They do not because they are poor or they face other financial constraints, and so sometimes they have no choice but to send their child to a bad school where they are not even safe.

All we want to do is give them a chance at a truly great education.

SCARING SENIORS

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a special place in hell for people in groups who scare seniors to raise money. Senior citizens all over the country receive dozens of letters a week, mass mailings from supposedly nonpartisan groups that confuse and frighten seniors in asking for their money to save Medicare and Social Security, letters like this one from some group called the United Senior' Association.

This last week I had a senior citizen calling me after he got this letter and literally crying because he could not afford to send the money, and he wanted to make sure he could still have Medicare. After a while I think senior citizens groups and senior citizens become convinced the sky is falling from some of these groups.

I represent a blue collar district, and I know that our seniors cannot afford to send \$10, \$15, \$20 to these groups in Washington, DC or Virginia. While many of these groups are run by partisan groups, some by Democrats, some by Republicans, Republicans are not amused. In fact, I saw a dear colleague this week from my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS]. He had his own problems with these mailing list groups on the subject of

Medicare private contracting. Admittedly, he and I come from different points of view, but we share the same problem from some of these groups.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1566 AND H.R. 600.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1566 and of H.R. 600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

A first group of such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on H.R. 2631, and a second group of such rollcall votes, if later postponed, will be taken after the debate has been concluded on those remaining motions to suspend the rules.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2534) to reform, extend, and repeal certain agricultural research, extension, and education programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2534

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND DEFINITIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION

Sec. 101. Priorities and management principles for federally supported and conducted agricultural research, education, and extension.

Sec. 102. Principal definitions regarding agricultural research, education, and extension.

Sec. 103. Consultation with National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board.

Sec. 104. Relevance and merit of federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education.

Sec. 105. Expansion of authority to enter into cost-reimbursable agreements.

Sec. 106. Evaluation and assessment of agricultural research, extension, and education programs.

TITLE II—REFORM OF EXISTING RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

Subtitle A—Smith-Lever Act and Hatch Act of 1887

Sec. 201. Adoption of short titles for Smith-Lever Act and Hatch Act of 1887.

Sec. 202. Consistent matching funds requirements under Hatch Act of 1887 and Smith-Lever Act.

Sec. 203. Plans of work to address critical research and extension issues and use of protocols to measure success of plans.

Subtitle B—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

Sec. 211. Plans of work for 1890 land-grant colleges to address critical research and extension issues and use of protocols to measure success of plans.

Sec. 212. Matching funds requirement for research and extension activities at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University.

Sec. 213. International research, extension, and teaching.

Sec. 214. Task force on 10-year strategic plan for agricultural research facilities.

Subtitle C—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

Sec. 231. Agricultural genome initiative.

Subtitle D—National Research Initiative

Sec. 241. Waiver of matching requirement for certain small colleges and universities.

Subtitle E—Other Existing Laws

Sec. 251. Findings, authorities, and competitive research grants under Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OR REPEAL OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Subtitle A—Extensions

Sec. 301. National Research Initiative under Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act.

Sec. 302. Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994.

Sec. 303. Education grants programs for Hispanic-serving institutions.

Sec. 304. General authorization for agricultural research programs.

Sec. 305. General authorization for extension education.

Sec. 306. Grants and fellowships for food and agricultural sciences education.

Sec. 307. Grants for research on the production and marketing of alcohols and industrial hydrocarbons from agricultural commodities and forest products.

Sec. 308. Policy research centers.

Sec. 309. Human nutrition intervention and health promotion research program.

Sec. 310. Pilot research program to combine medical and agricultural research.

Sec. 311. Food and nutrition education program.

Sec. 312. Animal health and disease continuing research.

Sec. 313. Animal health and disease national or regional research.

Sec. 314. Grant program to upgrade agricultural and food sciences facilities at 1890 land-grant colleges.

Sec. 315. National research and training centennial centers.

Sec. 316. Supplemental and alternative crops research.

Sec. 317. Aquaculture research and extension.

Sec. 318. Rangeland research.

Sec. 319. Federal agricultural research facilities.

Sec. 320. Water quality research, education, and coordination.

Sec. 321. National genetics resources program.

Sec. 322. Agricultural telecommunications program.

Sec. 323. Assistive technology program for farmers with disabilities.

Sec. 324. National Rural Information Center Clearinghouse.

Sec. 325. Critical Agricultural Materials Act.

Subtitle B—Repeals

Sec. 341. Aquaculture research facilities.

Sec. 342. Agricultural research program under National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act Amendments of 1981.

Sec. 343. Livestock product safety and inspection program.

Sec. 344. Generic authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—NEW RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Subtitle A—Partnerships for High-Value Agricultural Product Quality Research.

Sec. 401. Definitions.

Sec. 402. Establishment and characteristics of partnerships.

Sec. 403. Elements of grant making process.

Sec. 404. Authorization of appropriations and related provisions.

Subtitle B—Precision Agriculture

Sec. 411. Definitions.

Sec. 412. Competitive grants to promote precision agriculture.

Sec. 413. Reservation of funds for education and information dissemination projects.

Sec. 414. Precision agriculture partnerships.

Sec. 415. Miscellaneous provisions.

Sec. 416. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle C—Other Initiatives

Sec. 421. High-priority research and extension initiatives.

Sec. 422. Organic agriculture research and extension initiative.

Sec. 423. United States-Mexico joint agricultural research.

Sec. 424. Competitive grants for international agricultural science and education programs.

Sec. 425. Food animal residue avoidance database program.

Sec. 426. Development and commercialization of new biobased products.

Sec. 427. Thomas Jefferson Initiative for Crop Diversification.

Sec. 428. Integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants program.

Sec. 429. Research grants under Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Role of Secretary of Agriculture regarding food and agricultural sciences research, education, and extension.

Sec. 502. Office of Pest Management Policy.

Sec. 503. Food Safety Research Information Office and national conference.

- Sec. 504. Nutrient composition data.
- Sec. 505. Availability of funds received or collected on behalf of National Arboretum.
- Sec. 506. Retention and use of Agricultural Research Service patent culture collection fees.
- Sec. 507. Reimbursement of expenses incurred under Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1994.
- Sec. 508. Designation of Kika de la Garza Subtropical Agricultural Research Center, Weslaco, Texas.
- Sec. 509. Sense of Congress regarding Agricultural Research Service emphasis on in field research regarding methyl bromide alternatives.
- Sec. 510. Sense of Congress regarding importance of school-based agricultural education.
- Sec. 511. Sense of Congress regarding designation of Department Crisis Management Team.

TITLE I—COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND DEFINITIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION

SEC. 101. PRIORITIES AND MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERALLY SUPPORTED AND CONDUCTED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION.

(a) **PRIORITY SETTING PROCESS.**—Section 1402 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) **PURPOSES.**—” before “The purposes”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **PRIORITY SETTING PROCESS.**—Consistent with subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish priorities for agricultural research, extension, and education activities conducted or funded by the Department. In establishing such priorities, the Secretary shall solicit and consider input and recommendations from the Advisory Board and persons who conduct or use agricultural research, extension, or education.”

(b) **MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES.**—Such section is further amended by adding after subsection (b), as added by subsection (a)(2), the following new subsection:

“(c) **MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that agricultural research, education, and extension activities conducted or funded by the Department are accomplished in a manner that—

“(1) integrates agricultural research, education, and extension functions to better link research to technology transfer and information dissemination activities;

“(2) encourages multi-State and multi-institutional programs to address relevant issues of common concern and to better leverage scarce resources; and

“(3) achieves agricultural research, education, and extension objectives through multi-institutional and multifunctional approaches and by conducting research at facilities and institutions best equipped to achieve those objectives.”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended by inserting “, **PRIORITIES, AND MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES**” after “**PURPOSES**”.

SEC. 102. PRINCIPAL DEFINITIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION.

(a) **FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.**—Paragraph (8) of section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103) is amended to read as follows:

“(8) **FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.**—The term ‘food and agricultural sciences’ means basic, applied, and developmental research, extension, and teaching activities in food and fiber, agricultural, renewable natural resources, forestry, and physical and social sciences, including (but not limited to) activities relating to the following:

“(A) Animal health, production, and well-being.

“(B) Plant health and production.

“(C) Animal and plant germ plasm collection and preservation.

“(D) Aquaculture.

“(E) Food safety.

“(F) Soil and water conservation and improvement.

“(G) Forestry, horticulture, and range management.

“(H) Nutritional sciences and promotion.

“(I) Farm enhancement, including financial management, input efficiency, and profitability.

“(J) Home economics.

“(K) Rural human ecology.

“(L) Youth development and agricultural education, including 4-H.

“(M) Expansion of domestic and international markets for agricultural commodities and products, including agricultural trade barrier identification and comprehension.

“(N) Information management and technology transfer related to agriculture.

“(O) Biotechnology related to agriculture.”

(b) **REFERENCES TO TEACHING OR EDUCATION.**—Paragraph (14) of such section is amended by striking “the term ‘teaching’ means” and inserting “**TEACHING AND EDUCATION.**—The terms ‘teaching’ and ‘education’ mean”.

(c) **APPLICATION OF DEFINITIONS TO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.**—Such section is further amended by striking the section heading and all that follows through the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1404. PRINCIPAL DEFINITIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION.

“When used in this title or any other law relating to any research, extension, or education activities of the Department of Agriculture regarding the food and agricultural sciences (unless the context requires otherwise):”

(d) **IN-KIND SUPPORT.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) **IN-KIND SUPPORT.**—The term ‘in-kind support’, with regard to a requirement that the recipient of funds provided by the Secretary match all or some portion of the amount of the funds, means contributions such as office space, equipment, and staff support.”

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking “the term” in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), (10) through (13), and (15), (16), and (17) and inserting “The term”; (2) in paragraph (4), by striking “the terms” and inserting “The terms”; (3) in paragraph (9), by striking “the term” the first place it appears and inserting “The term”;

(4) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraphs (1) through (7) and (9) through (15) and inserting a period; and

(5) in paragraph (16)(F), by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

SEC. 103. CONSULTATION WITH NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.

Subsection (d) of section 1408 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and

Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **CONSULTATION.**—

“(1) **AS AFFECTING ADVISORY BOARD.**—In carrying out this section, the Advisory Board shall solicit opinions and recommendations from persons who will benefit from and use federally funded agricultural research, extension, education, and economics.

“(2) **AS AFFECTING SECRETARY.**—To comply with a provision of this title or any other law that requires the Secretary to consult or cooperate with the Advisory Board or that authorizes the Advisory Board to submit recommendations to the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

“(A) solicit the written opinions and recommendations of the Advisory Board; and

“(B) provide a written response to the Advisory Board regarding the manner and extent to which the Secretary will implement recommendations submitted by the Advisory Board.”

SEC. 104. RELEVANCE AND MERIT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.

(a) **REVIEW OF RELEVANCE AND MERIT.**—Subtitle K of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting before section 1463 (7 U.S.C. 3311) the following new section:

“SEC. 1461. RELEVANCE AND MERIT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.

“(a) **REVIEW OF COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE.**—

“(1) **PEER REVIEW OF RESEARCH GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall establish procedures that provide for scientific peer review of each agricultural research grant administered, on a competitive basis, by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service of the Department.

“(2) **MERIT REVIEW OF EXTENSION AND EDUCATION.**—The Secretary shall establish procedures that provide for merit review of each agricultural extension or education grant administered, on a competitive basis, by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. The Secretary shall consult with the Advisory Board in establishing such merit review procedures.

“(b) **REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS: REQUEST AND CONSIDERATION OF INPUT.**—When formulating a request for proposals involving an agricultural research, extension, or education activity to be funded by the Secretary on a competitive basis, the Secretary shall solicit and consider input from the Advisory Board and users of agricultural research, extension, and education regarding the request for proposals for the preceding year. If an agricultural research, extension, or education activity has not been the subject of a previous request for proposals, the Secretary shall solicit and consider input from the Advisory Board and users of agricultural research, extension, and education before publication of the first request for proposals regarding the activity.

“(c) **SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.**—

“(1) **PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall establish procedures that ensure scientific peer review of all research activities conducted by the Department of Agriculture.

“(2) **REVIEW PANEL REQUIRED.**—As part of the procedures established under paragraph (1), a review panel shall verify, at least once every three years, that each research activity of the Department and research conducted under each research program of the Department have scientific merit and relevance. If the research activity or program

to be reviewed is included in the research, educational, and economics mission area of the Department, the review panel shall consider—

“(A) the scientific merit and relevance of the activity or research in light of the priorities established pursuant to section 1402(b); and

“(B) the national or multi-State significance of the activity or research.

“(3) COMPOSITION OF REVIEW PANEL.—A review panel shall be composed of individuals with scientific expertise, a majority of whom are not employees of the agency whose research is being reviewed. To the extent possible, the Secretary shall use scientists from colleges and universities to serve on the review panels.

“(4) SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.—The results of the panel reviews shall be submitted to the Advisory Board.

“(5) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and title XVIII of this Act (7 U.S.C. 2281 et seq.) shall not apply to a review panel.

“(d) MERIT REVIEW OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS.—Effective beginning October 1, 1998, to be eligible to obtain agricultural research or extension funds from the Secretary for an activity, a land-grant college or university shall—

“(A) establish a process for merit review of the activity; and

“(B) review the activity in accordance with the process.

“(2) 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Effective beginning October 1, 1998, to obtain agricultural extension funds from the Secretary for an activity, each 1994 Institution (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382; 7 U.S.C. 301 note)) shall—

“(A) establish a process for merit review of the activity; and

“(B) review the activity in accordance with the process.”

(b) REPEAL OF PROVISIONS FOR WITHHOLDING FUNDS.—

(1) SMITH-LEVER ACT.—Section 6 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 346) is repealed.

(2) HATCH ACT OF 1887.—Section 7 of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361g) is amended by striking the last paragraph.

(3) NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING POLICY ACT OF 1977.—The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended—

(A) in section 1444 (7 U.S.C. 3221)—

(i) by striking subsection (f); and

(ii) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f);

(B) in section 1445(g) (7 U.S.C. 3222(g)), by striking paragraph (3); and

(C) by striking section 1468 (7 U.S.C. 3314).

SEC. 105. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO COST-REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS.

Section 1473A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319a) is amended in the first sentence by inserting “or other colleges and universities” after “institutions”.

SEC. 106. EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct a performance evaluation to determine whether agricultural research, extension, and education programs conducted or funded by the Department of Agriculture result in public benefits that have national or multi-State significance.

(b) GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—The Secretary shall develop prac-

tical guidelines for measuring the performance of agricultural research, extension and education programs evaluated under subsection (a).

TITLE II—REFORM OF EXISTING RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

Subtitle A—Smith-Lever Act and Hatch Act of 1887

SEC. 201. ADOPTION OF SHORT TITLES FOR SMITH-LEVER ACT AND HATCH ACT OF 1887.

(a) SMITH-LEVER ACT.—The Act of May 8, 1914 (commonly known as the Smith-Lever Act; 7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 11. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Smith-Lever Act’.”

(b) HATCH ACT OF 1887.—The Act of March 2, 1887 (commonly known as the Hatch Act of 1887; 7 U.S.C. 361a et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 10. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Hatch Act of 1887’.”

(c) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of executing amendments made by provisions of this Act (other than this section), this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before the other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 202. CONSISTENT MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENTS UNDER HATCH ACT OF 1887 AND SMITH-LEVER ACT.

(a) HATCH ACT OF 1887.—Subsection (d) of section 3 of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361c) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), no allotment shall be made to a State under subsections (b) and (c), and no payments of such allotment shall be made to a State, in excess of the amount which the State makes available out of non-Federal funds for agricultural research and for the establishment and maintenance of facilities for the performance of such research.

“(2) FAILURE TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS.—If a State fails to comply with the requirement to provide matching funds for a fiscal year under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold from payment to the State for that fiscal year an amount equal to the difference between—

“(A) the amount that would be allotted and paid to the State under subsections (b) and (c) (if the full amount of matching funds were provided by the State); and

“(B) the amount of matching funds actually provided by the State.

“(3) REAPPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary shall reapportion amounts withheld under paragraph (2) for a fiscal year among the States satisfying the matching requirement for that fiscal year. Any reapportionment of funds under this paragraph shall be subject to the matching requirement specified in paragraph (1).

“(4) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to funds provided to a State from the Regional research fund, State agricultural experiment stations.”

(b) SMITH-LEVER ACT.—Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “That payments” and all that follows through “Provided further.”; and

(2) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(e) MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—No allotment shall be made to a State under subsections (b) and (c), and no payments of such allotment shall be made to a State, in excess of the amount which the State makes available out of non-Federal funds for cooperative extension work.

“(2) FAILURE TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS.—If a State fails to comply with the requirement to provide matching funds for a fiscal year under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold from payment to the State for that fiscal year an amount equal to the difference between—

“(A) the amount that would be allotted and paid to the State under subsections (b) and (c) (if the full amount of matching funds were provided by the State); and

“(B) the amount of matching funds actually provided by the State.

“(3) REAPPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary shall reapportion amounts withheld under paragraph (2) for a fiscal year among the States satisfying the matching requirement for that fiscal year. Any reapportionment of funds under this paragraph shall be subject to the matching requirement specified in paragraph (1).

“(f) MATCHING FUNDS EXCEPTION FOR 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—There shall be no matching requirement for funds made available to 1994 Institutions pursuant to subsection (b)(3).”

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) RECOGNITION OF STATEHOOD OF ALASKA AND HAWAII.—Section 1 of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a) is amended by striking “Alaska, Hawaii.”

(2) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “Federal Extension Service” and inserting “Secretary of Agriculture”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Federal Extension Service” and inserting “Secretary of Agriculture”;

(C) in subsection (d), by striking “Federal Extension Service” and inserting “Secretary of Agriculture”; and

(D) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “through the Federal Extension Service”.

(3) REFERENCES TO REGIONAL RESEARCH FUND.—The Hatch Act of 1887 is amended—

(A) in section 3 (7 U.S.C. 361c)—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “subsection 3(c)(3)” and inserting “subsection (c)(3)”; and

(ii) in subsection (e), by striking “subsection 3(c)(3)” and inserting “subsection (c)(3)”; and

(B) in section 5 (7 U.S.C. 361e), by striking “regional research fund authorized by subsection 3(c)(3)” and inserting “Regional research fund, State agricultural experiment stations”.

SEC. 203. PLANS OF WORK TO ADDRESS CRITICAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ISSUES AND USE OF PROTOCOLS TO MEASURE SUCCESS OF PLANS.

(a) SMITH-LEVER ACT.—Section 4 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 344) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 4.” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 4. ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT OF STATE TO FUNDS, TIME AND MANNER OF PAYMENT, STATE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, AND PLANS FOR WORK.

“(a) ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT.—”;

(2) in the last sentence, by striking “Such sums” and inserting the following:

“(b) TIME AND MANNER OF PAYMENT; RELATED REPORTS.—The amount to which a State is entitled”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(c) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PLAN OF WORK.—Each extension plan of work for a State required under subsection (a) shall contain descriptions of the following:

“(1) The critical short-term, intermediate, and long-term agricultural issues in the State and the current and planned extension programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(2) The process established to consult with extension users regarding the identification of critical agricultural issues in the State and the development of extension programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(3) The efforts made to identify and collaborate with other colleges and universities within the State and other States that have unique capacity to address the identified agricultural issues in the State and current and emerging efforts to work with these other institutions and States.

"(4) The manner in which research and extension, including research and extension activities funded other than through formula funds, will cooperate to address the critical issues in the State, including the activities to be carried out separately, the activities to be carried out sequentially, and the activities to be carried out jointly.

"(5) The education and outreach programs already underway to convey currently available research results that are pertinent to a critical agricultural issue, including efforts to encourage multi-county cooperation in the dissemination of research results.

"(d) EXTENSION PROTOCOLS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop protocols to be used to evaluate the success of multi-State, multi-institutional, and multidisciplinary extension activities and joint research and extension activities in addressing critical agricultural issues identified in the plans of work submitted under subsection (a). The Secretary shall develop the protocols in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board and land-grant colleges and universities.

"(e) TREATMENT OF PLANS OF WORK FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall consider plans of work submitted under subsection (a) to satisfy other appropriate Federal reporting requirements."

(b) HATCH ACT OF 1887.—Section 7 of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361g), as amended by section 104(b), is further amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 7." and inserting the following:

"SEC. 7. DUTIES OF SECRETARY. ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT OF STATE TO FUNDS, AND PLANS FOR WORK.

"(a) DUTIES OF SECRETARY.—"

(b) by striking "On or before" and inserting the following:

"(b) ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT.—On or before";

(3) by striking "Whenever it shall appear" and inserting the following:

"(c) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO EXPEND FULL ALLOTMENT.—Whenever it shall appear"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(d) PLAN OF WORK REQUIRED.—Before funds may be provided to a State under this Act for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this Act shall be submitted by the proper officials of the State and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(e) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PLAN OF WORK.—Each research plan of work for a State required under subsection (d) shall contain descriptions of the following:

"(1) The critical short-term, intermediate, and long-term agricultural issues in the State and the current and planned research programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(2) The process established to consult with users of agricultural research regarding the identification of critical agricultural issues in the State and the development of research programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(3) The efforts made to identify and collaborate with other colleges and universities

within the State and other States that have unique capacity to address the identified agricultural issues in the State and current and emerging efforts (including regional efforts) to work with these other institutions and States.

"(4) The manner in which research and extension, including research and extension activities funded other than through formula funds, will cooperate to address the critical issues in the State, including the activities to be carried out separately, the activities to be carried out sequentially, and the activities to be carried out jointly.

"(f) RESEARCH PROTOCOLS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop protocols to be used to evaluate the success of multi-State, multi-institutional, and multidisciplinary research activities and joint research and extension activities in addressing critical agricultural issues identified in the plans of work submitted under subsection (d). The Secretary shall develop the protocols in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board and land-grant colleges and universities.

"(g) TREATMENT OF PLANS OF WORK FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall consider plans of work submitted under subsection (d) to satisfy other appropriate Federal reporting requirements."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

(2) DELAYED APPLICABILITY.—With respect to a particular State, the Secretary of Agriculture may delay the applicability of the requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section until not later than October 1, 1999, if the Secretary finds that the State will be unable to meet such requirements by October 1, 1998, despite the good faith efforts of the State.

Subtitle B—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

SEC. 211. PLANS OF WORK FOR 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES TO ADDRESS CRITICAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ISSUES AND USE OF PROTOCOLS TO MEASURE SUCCESS OF PLANS.

(a) EXTENSION AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 1444(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(d)" and inserting the following:

"(d) ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT TO FUNDS; TIME AND MANNER OF PAYMENT; STATE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS; AND PLANS FOR WORK.—"

"(1) ASCERTAINMENT OF ENTITLEMENT.—"

(2) in the last sentence, by striking "Such sums" and inserting the following:

"(2) TIME AND MANNER OF PAYMENT; RELATED REPORTS.—The amount to which an eligible institution is entitled"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(3) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PLAN OF WORK.—Each extension plan of work for an eligible institution required under this section shall contain descriptions of the following:

"(A) The critical short-term, intermediate, and long-term agricultural issues in the State in which the eligible institution is located and the current and planned extension programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(B) The process established to consult with extension users regarding the identification of critical agricultural issues in the State and the development of extension programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(C) The efforts made to identify and collaborate with other colleges and universities within the State and other States that have unique capacity to address the identified agricultural issues in the State and current and emerging efforts (including regional research efforts) to work with these other institutions and States.

"(D) The manner in which research and extension, including research and extension activities funded other than through formula funds, will cooperate to address the critical issues in the State, including the activities to be carried out separately, the activities to be carried out sequentially, and the activities to be carried out jointly.

"(E) The education and outreach programs already underway to convey currently available research results that are pertinent to a critical agricultural issue, including efforts to encourage multi-county cooperation in the dissemination of research results.

"(4) EXTENSION PROTOCOLS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop protocols to be used to evaluate the success of multi-State, multi-institutional, and multidisciplinary extension activities and joint research and extension activities in addressing critical agricultural issues identified in the plans of work submitted under this section. The Secretary shall develop the protocols in consultation with the Advisory Board and land-grant colleges and universities.

"(5) TREATMENT OF PLANS OF WORK FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall consider plans of work submitted under this section to satisfy other appropriate Federal reporting requirements."

(b) AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 1445(c) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 3222(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(c)" and inserting the following:

"(c) PROGRAM AND PLANS FOR WORK.—"

"(1) INITIAL COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.—"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) PLAN OF WORK REQUIRED.—Before funds may be provided to an eligible institution under this section for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this section shall be submitted by the research director specified in subsection (d) and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PLAN OF WORK.—Each research plan of work required under paragraph (2) shall contain descriptions of the following:

"(A) The critical short-term, intermediate, and long-term agricultural issues in the State in which the eligible institution is located and the current and planned research programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(B) The process established to consult with users of agricultural research regarding the identification of critical agricultural issues in the State and the development of research programs and projects targeted to address such issues.

"(C) Other colleges and universities in the State and other States that have unique capacity to address the identified agricultural issues in the State.

"(D) The current and emerging efforts to work with these other institutions and States to build on each other's experience and take advantage of each institution's unique capacities.

"(E) The manner in which research and extension, including research and extension activities funded other than through formula funds, will cooperate to address the critical issues in the State, including the activities to be carried out separately, the activities to

be carried out sequentially, and the activities to be carried out jointly.

"(4) RESEARCH PROTOCOLS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop protocols to be used to evaluate the success of multi-State, multi-institutional, and multidisciplinary research activities and joint research and extension activities in addressing critical agricultural issues identified in the plans of work submitted under paragraph (2). The Secretary shall develop the protocols in consultation with the Advisory Board and land-grant colleges and universities."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

(2) DELAYED APPLICABILITY.—With respect to a particular eligible institution (as described in sections 1444(a) and 1445(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221(a), 3222(a))), the Secretary of Agriculture may delay the applicability of the requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section until not later than October 1, 1999, if the Secretary finds that the eligible institution will be unable to meet such requirements by October 1, 1998, despite the good faith efforts of the eligible institution.

SEC. 212. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT FOR RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

(a) IMPOSITION OF REQUIREMENT.—Subtitle G of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1448 (7 U.S.C. 3222c) the following new section:

"SEC. 1449. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT FOR RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES AT ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible institution' means a college eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.) (commonly known as the Second Morrill Act), including Tuskegee University.

"(2) FORMULA FUNDS.—The term 'formula funds' means the formula allocation funds distributed to eligible institutions under sections 1444 and 1445.

"(b) DETERMINATION OF NON-FEDERAL SOURCES OF FUNDS.—Not later than September 30, 1999, each eligible institution shall submit to the Secretary a report describing for fiscal year 1999 the sources of non-Federal funds available to the eligible institution and the amount of funds generally available from each such source.

"(c) MATCHING FORMULA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the distribution of formula funds to an eligible institution shall be subject to the following matching requirements:

"(1) In fiscal year 2000, the institution shall provide matching funds from non-Federal sources in an amount equal to not less than 30 percent of the formula funds to be distributed to the eligible institution.

"(2) In fiscal year 2001, the institution shall provide matching funds from non-Federal sources in an amount equal to not less than 45 percent of the formula funds to be distributed to the eligible institution.

"(3) In fiscal year 2002, and each fiscal year thereafter, the institution shall provide matching funds from non-Federal sources in an amount equal to not less than 50 percent of the formula funds to be distributed to the eligible institution.

"(d) LIMITED WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (f), the Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement

under subsection (c)(1) for fiscal year 2000 if the Secretary determines with regard to a particular eligible institution, based on the report received under subsection (b), that the eligible institution will be unlikely to satisfy the matching requirement. The waiver of the matching requirements for subsequent fiscal years is not permitted.

"(e) USE OF MATCHING FUNDS.—Under terms and conditions established by the Secretary, matching funds provided as required by subsection (c) may be used by an eligible institution for research, education, and extension activities.

"(f) REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—Federal funds that are not matched by an eligible institution in accordance with subsection (c) for a fiscal year shall be redistributed by the Secretary to eligible institutions satisfying the matching funds requirement for that fiscal year. Any redistribution of funds under this subsection shall be subject to the applicable matching requirement specified in subsection (c) and shall be made in a manner consistent with sections 1444 and 1445, as determined by the Secretary."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1445(g) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 3222(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(c) REFERENCES TO TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.—Such Act is further amended—

(1) in section 1404 (7 U.S.C. 3103), by striking "Tuskegee Institute" in paragraphs (10) and (16)(B) and inserting "Tuskegee University";

(2) in section 1444 (7 U.S.C. 3221)—

(A) by striking the section heading and "SEC. 1444." and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1444. EXTENSION AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY."; and

(B) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking "Tuskegee Institute" both places it appears and inserting "Tuskegee University"; and

(3) in section 1445 (7 U.S.C. 3222)—

(A) by striking the section heading and "SEC. 1445." and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1445. AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY."; and

(B) in subsections (a) and (b)(2)(B), by striking "Tuskegee Institute" both places it appears and inserting "Tuskegee University".

SEC. 213. INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING.

(a) INCLUSION OF TEACHING.—Section 1458 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "RESEARCH AND EXTENSION" and inserting "RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "related research and extension" and inserting "related research, extension, and teaching"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "research and extension on" and inserting "research, extension, and teaching activities addressing";

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (6), by striking "education" and inserting "teaching";

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking "scientists and experts" and inserting "science and education experts";

(D) in paragraph (5), by inserting "teaching," after "development,";

(E) in paragraph (7), by striking "research and extension that is" and inserting "research, extension, and teaching programs"; and

(F) in paragraph (8), by striking "research capabilities" and inserting "research, extension, and teaching capabilities"; and

(3) in subsection (b), by striking "counterpart agencies" and inserting "counterpart research, extension, and teaching agencies".

(b) FULL PAYMENT OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR CERTAIN BINATIONAL PROJECT.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) FULL PAYMENT OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR CERTAIN BINATIONAL PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the full amount of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out cooperative projects under the arrangement entered into between the Secretary and the Government of Israel to support the Israel-United States Binational Agricultural Research and Development Fund shall be paid directly to the Fund."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The subtitle heading of subtitle I of title XIV of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle I—International Research, Extension, and Teaching".

SEC. 214. TASK FORCE ON 10-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) TRANSFER OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 4 of the Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390b)—

(1) is transferred to the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.);

(2) is redesignated as section 1473B;

(3) is inserted after section 1473A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319a); and

(4) is amended in subsection (f), by striking "Notwithstanding section 2(l), in" and inserting "In".

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—The Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390 et seq.) is repealed.

Subtitle C—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

SEC. 231. AGRICULTURAL GENOME INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF INITIATIVE.—Section 1671 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5924) is amended by striking the section heading and subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 1671. AGRICULTURAL GENOME INITIATIVE.

"(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a research initiative for the purpose of—

"(1) supporting basic and applied research and technology development in the area of genome structure and function in support of agriculturally important species, with a particular focus on research projects that will yield scientifically important results that will enhance the usefulness of many agriculturally important species;

"(2) studying and mapping agriculturally significant genes to achieve sustainable and secure agricultural production;

"(3) ensuring that current gaps in existing agricultural genetics knowledge are filled;

"(4) identifying and developing a functional understanding of genes responsible for economically important traits in agriculturally important species, including emerging plant and animal diseases causing economic hardship;

"(5) ensuring the future genetic improvement of agriculturally important species;

"(6) supporting the preservation of diverse germplasm; and

"(7) ensuring the preservation of biodiversity to maintain access to genes that may be of importance in the future."

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (a)”.

(c) GRANT TYPES AND PROCESS; PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(c) GRANT TYPES AND PROCESS; PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraphs (6), (7), and (11) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) shall apply with respect to the making of grants under this section.”.

(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(d) MATCHING OF FUNDS.—

“(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—If a grant under this section is to the particular benefit of a specific agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall require the recipient of the grant to provide funds or in-kind support to match the amount of funds provided by the Secretary in the grant.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement specified in paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the results of the project, while of particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(B) the project involves a minor commodity, deals with scientifically important research, and the grant recipient would be unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal years 1996 and 1997” and inserting “fiscal years 1998 through 2002”.

Subtitle D—National Research Initiative

SEC. 241. WAIVER OF MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN SMALL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Subsection (b)(8)(B) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) is amended—

(1) by striking “the cost” and inserting “the cost of”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary may waive all or a portion of the matching requirement under this subparagraph in the case of a smaller college or university (as described in subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii) of section 793 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 2204f)) if the equipment to be acquired costs not more than \$25,000 and has multiple uses within a single research project or is usable in more than one research project.”.

Subtitle E—Other Existing Laws

SEC. 251. FINDINGS, AUTHORITIES, AND COMPETITIVE RESEARCH GRANTS UNDER FOREST AND RANGELAND RENEWABLE RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1978.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 2 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1641) is amended by striking “SEC. 2.” and subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

“(1) Forests and rangelands, and the resources of forests and rangelands, are of strategic economic and ecological importance to the United States, and the Federal Government has an important and substantial role in ensuring the continued health, productivity, and sustainability of the Nation’s forests and rangelands.

“(2) Over 75 percent of the productive commercial forest land in the United States is in private ownership, with some 60 percent owned by small nonindustrial private owners. These 10,000,000 nonindustrial private

owners are critical to providing both commodity and noncommodity values to the citizens of the United States.

“(3) The National Forest System manages only 17 percent of the Nation’s commercial timberlands, with over half of the standing softwoods inventory located on those lands. Dramatic changes in Federal agency policy during the early 1990’s have significantly curtailed the management of this vast timber resource, causing abrupt shifts in the supply of timber from public to private ownership. As a result of these shifts in supply, some 60 percent of total wood production in the United States is now coming from private forest lands in the southern United States.

“(4) At the same time that pressures are building for the removal of even more land from commercial production, the Federal Government is significantly reducing its commitment to productivity-related research regarding forests and rangelands, which is critically needed by the private sector for the sustained management of remaining available timber and forage resources for the benefit of all species.

“(5) Uncertainty over the availability of the United States timber supply, increasing regulatory burdens, and the lack of Federal Government support for research is causing domestic wood and paper producers to move outside the United States to find reliable sources of wood supplies, which in turn results in a worsening of the United States trade balance, the loss of employment and infrastructure investments, and an increased risk of infestations of exotic pests and diseases from imported wood products.

“(6) Wood and paper producers in the United States are being challenged not only by shifts in Government policy, but also by international competition from tropical countries where growth rates of trees far exceed those in the United States. Wood production per acre will need to quadruple from 1996 levels for the United States forestry sector to remain internationally competitive on an ever decreasing forest land base.

“(7) Better and more frequent forest inventorying and analysis is necessary to identify productivity-related forestry research needs and to provide forest managers with the current data necessary to make timely and effective management decisions.”.

(b) HIGH PRIORITY FORESTRY RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—Subsection (d) of section 3 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) HIGH PRIORITY FORESTRY AND RANGELANDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—The Secretary may conduct, support, and cooperate in forestry and rangelands research and education that is of the highest priority to the United States and to users of public and private forest lands and rangelands in the United States. Such research and education priorities include the following:

“(1) The biology of forest organisms and rangeland organisms.

“(2) Functional characteristics and cost-effective management of forest and rangeland ecosystems.

“(3) Interactions between humans and forests and rangelands.

“(4) Wood and forage as a raw material.

“(5) International trade, competition, and cooperation.”.

(c) FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS.—Section 3 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS.—

“(1) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—In compliance with existing statutory authority, the Sec-

retary shall establish a program to inventory and analyze, in a timely manner, public and private forests and their resources in the United States.

“(2) ANNUAL STATE INVENTORY.—Not later than the end of each full fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare for each State, in cooperation with the State forester for the State, an inventory of forests and their resources in the State. For purposes of preparing the inventory for a State, the Secretary shall measure annually 20 percent of all sample plots that are included in the inventory program for that State. Upon completion of the inventory for a year, the Secretary shall make available to the public a compilation of all data collected for that year from measurements of sample plots as well as any analysis made of such samples.

“(3) FIVE-YEAR REPORTS.—At intervals not greater than every five full fiscal years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare, publish, and make available to the public a report, prepared in cooperation with State foresters, that—

“(A) contains a description of each State inventory of forests and their resources, incorporating all sample plot measurements conducted during the five years covered by the report;

“(B) displays and analyzes on a nationwide basis the results of the annual reports required by paragraph (2); and

“(C) contains an analysis of forest health conditions and trends over the previous two decades, with an emphasis on such conditions and trends during the period subsequent to the immediately preceding report under this paragraph.

“(4) NATIONAL STANDARDS AND DEFINITIONS.—To ensure uniform and consistent data collection for all public and private forest ownerships and each State, the Secretary shall develop, in consultation with State foresters and Federal land management agencies not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, and publish national standards and definitions to be applied in inventorying and analyzing forests and their resources under this subsection. The standards shall include a core set of variables to be measured on all sample plots under paragraph (2) and a standard set of tables to be included in the reports under paragraph (3).

“(5) PROTECTION FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall obtain written authorization from property owners prior to collecting data from sample plots located on private property pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(6) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a strategic plan to implement and carry out this subsection, including the annual updates required by paragraph (2) and the reports required by paragraph (3), that shall describe in detail—

“(A) the financial resources required to implement and carry out this subsection, including the identification of any resources required in excess of the amounts provided for forest inventorying and analysis in recent appropriations Acts;

“(B) the personnel necessary to implement and carry out this subsection, including any personnel in addition to personnel currently performing inventorying and analysis functions;

“(C) the organization and procedures necessary to implement and carry out this subsection, including proposed coordination with Federal land management agencies and State foresters;

“(D) the schedules for annual sample plot measurements in each State inventory required by paragraph (2) within the first five-year interval after the date of the enactment of this subsection;

“(E) the core set of variables to be measured in each sample plot under paragraph (2) and the standard set of tables to be used in each State and national report under paragraph (3); and

“(F) the process for employing, in coordination with the Department of Energy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, remote sensing, global positioning systems, and other advanced technologies to carry out this subsection, and the subsequent use of such technologies.”.

(d) **FORESTRY AND RANGELANDS COMPETITIVE RESEARCH GRANTS.**—Section 5 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and “SEC. 5.” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 5. FORESTRY AND RANGELANDS COMPETITIVE RESEARCH GRANTS.

“(a) **COMPETITIVE GRANT AUTHORITY.**—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(b) **EMPHASIS ON CERTAIN HIGH PRIORITY FORESTRY RESEARCH.**—The Secretary may use up to five percent of the amounts made available for research under section 3 to make competitive grants regarding forestry research in the high priority research areas identified in section 3(d).

“(c) **EMPHASIS ON CERTAIN HIGH PRIORITY RANGELANDS RESEARCH.**—The Secretary may use up to five percent of the amounts made available for research under section 3 to make competitive grants regarding rangelands research in the high priority research areas identified in section 3(d).

“(d) **PRIORITIES.**—In making grants under subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall give priority to research proposals in which—

“(1) the proposed research will be collaborative research organized through a center of scientific excellence;

“(2) the applicant agrees to provide matching funds (in the form of direct funding or in-kind support) in an amount equal to not less than 50 percent of the grant amount; and

“(3) the proposed research will be conducted as part of an existing private and public partnership or cooperative research effort and involves several interested research partners.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OR REPEAL OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Subtitle A—Extensions

SEC. 301. NATIONAL RESEARCH INITIATIVE UNDER COMPETITIVE, SPECIAL, AND FACILITIES RESEARCH GRANT ACT.

Subsection (b)(10) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(10)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 302. EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LAND-GRANT STATUS ACT OF 1994.

Sections 533(b) and 535 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382; 7 U.S.C. 301 note) are amended by striking “2000” each place it appears and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 303. EDUCATION GRANTS PROGRAMS FOR HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1455(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3241(c)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 1997” and inserting “each of the fiscal years 1997 through 2002”.

SEC. 304. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1463 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311) is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking “1997” each place it appears and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 305. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR EXTENSION EDUCATION.

Section 1464 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3312) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 306. GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES EDUCATION.

Section 1417(j) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3152(j)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 307. GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON THE PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF ALCOHOLS AND INDUSTRIAL HYDROCARBONS FROM AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND FOREST PRODUCTS.

Section 1419(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3154(d)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 308. POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Section 1419A(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3155(d)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 1996 and 1997” and inserting “each of fiscal years 1996 through 2002”.

SEC. 309. HUMAN NUTRITION INTERVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 1424(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174(d)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 1996 and 1997” and inserting “each of fiscal years 1996 through 2002”.

SEC. 310. PILOT RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBINE MEDICAL AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Section 1424A(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174A(d)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 1997” and inserting “each of fiscal years 1997 through 2002”.

SEC. 311. FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 1425(c)(3) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(c)(3)) is amended by striking “and 1997” and inserting “through 2002”.

SEC. 312. ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE CONTINUING RESEARCH.

Section 1433(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 313. ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE NATIONAL OR REGIONAL RESEARCH.

Section 1434(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3196(a)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 314. GRANT PROGRAM TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENCES FACILITIES AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES.

Section 1447(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b(b)) is amended by striking “and 1997” and inserting “through 2002”.

SEC. 315. NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTENNIAL CENTERS.

Section 1448 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “and 1997” and inserting “through 2002”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 316. SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CROPS RESEARCH.

Section 1473D(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d(a)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 317. AQUACULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.

Section 1477 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3324) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 318. RANGELAND RESEARCH.

Section 1483(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3336(a)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 319. FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

Section 1431 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act Amendments of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; 99 Stat. 1566) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 320. WATER QUALITY RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND COORDINATION.

Section 1481(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5501(d)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 321. NATIONAL GENETICS RESOURCES PROGRAM.

Section 1635(b) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5844(b)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 322. AGRICULTURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM.

Section 1673(h) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926(h)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 323. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM FOR FARMERS WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1680 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(6)(B), by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 324. NATIONAL RURAL INFORMATION CENTER CLEARINGHOUSE.

Section 2381(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3125b(e)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

SEC. 325. CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT.

Section 16(a) of the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178n(a)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2002”.

Subtitle B—Repeals

SEC. 341. AQUACULTURE RESEARCH FACILITIES.

Section 1476 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3323) is repealed.

SEC. 342. AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM UNDER NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1981.

Subsection (b) of section 1432 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act Amendments of 1981 (Public Law 97-98; 7 U.S.C. 3222 note) is repealed.

SEC. 343. LIVESTOCK PRODUCT SAFETY AND INSPECTION PROGRAM.

Section 1670 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5923) is repealed.

SEC. 344. GENERIC AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Sections 897 and 898 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 110 Stat. 1184) are repealed.

TITLE IV—NEW RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION INITIATIVES**Subtitle A—Partnerships for High-Value Agricultural Product Quality Research****SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this subtitle:

(1) **ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “eligible partnership” means a partnership consisting of a land-grant college or university and other entities specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 402 that satisfies the eligibility criteria contained in such subsection.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT BY GRANT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may make grants to an eligible partnership to coordinate and manage research and extension activities to enhance the quality of high-value agricultural products.

(2) **AWARDING OF GRANTS.**—Grants under paragraph (1) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

(b) **CRITERIA FOR AN ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP.**—

(1) **PRIMARY INSTITUTIONS IN PARTNERSHIP.**—The primary institution involved in an eligible partnership shall be a land-grant college or university, acting in partnership with other colleges or universities, nonprofit research and development entities, and Federal laboratories.

(2) **PRIORITIZATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.**—An eligible partnership shall prioritize research and extension activities in order to—

(A) enhance the competitiveness of United States agricultural products;

(B) increase exports of such products; and

(C) substitute such products for imported products.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—An eligible partnership shall coordinate among the entities comprising the partnership the activities supported by the eligible partnership, including the provision of mechanisms for sharing resources between institutions and laboratories and the coordination of public and private sector partners to maximize cost-effectiveness.

(c) **TYPES OF RESEARCH AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES.**—Research or extension supported by an eligible partnership may address the full spectrum of production, processing, packaging, transportation, and marketing issues related to a high-value agricultural product. Such issues include—

(1) environmentally responsible—

(A) pest management alternatives and biotechnology;

(B) sustainable farming methods; and

(C) soil conservation and enhanced resource management;

(2) genetic research to develop improved agricultural-based products;

(3) refinement of field production practices and technology to improve quality, yield, and production efficiencies;

(4) processing and package technology to improve product quality, stability, or flavor intensity;

(5) marketing research regarding consumer perceptions and preferences;

(6) economic research, including industry characteristics, growth, competitive analysis; and

(7) research to facilitate diversified, value-added enterprises in rural areas.

SEC. 403. ELEMENTS OF GRANT MAKING PROCESS.

(a) **PERIOD OF GRANT.**—The Secretary may award a grant under this subtitle for a period not to exceed five years.

(b) **PREFERENCES.**—In making grants under this subtitle, the Secretary shall give preference to proposals that—

(1) demonstrate linkages with—

(A) agencies of the Department of Agriculture;

(B) other related Federal research laboratories and agencies;

(C) colleges and universities; and

(D) private industry; and

(2) guarantee matching funds in excess of the amounts required by subsection (c).

(c) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—An eligible partnership shall contribute an amount of non-Federal funds for the operation of the partnership that is at least equal to the amount of grant funds received under this subtitle.

(d) **LIMITATION ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS.**—Funds provided under this subtitle may not be used for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility.

SEC. 404. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(b) **LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Not more than four percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subtitle may be retained by the Secretary to pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Precision Agriculture**SEC. 411. DEFINITIONS.**

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) **PRECISION AGRICULTURE.**—The term “precision agriculture” means an integrated information- and production-based farming system that is designed to increase long-term, site specific and whole farm production efficiencies, productivity, and profitability while minimizing unintended impacts on wildlife and the environment by—

(A) combining agricultural sciences, agricultural inputs and practices, agronomic production databases, and precision agriculture technologies to efficiently manage agronomic and livestock production systems;

(B) gathering on-farm information pertaining to the variation and interaction of site-specific spatial and temporal factors affecting crop and livestock production;

(C) integrating such information with appropriate data derived from field scouting, remote sensing, and other precision agriculture technologies in a timely manner in order to facilitate on-farm decisionmaking; or

(D) using such information to prescribe and deliver site-specific application of agricultural inputs and management practices in agricultural production systems.

(2) **PRECISION AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGIES.**—The term “precision agriculture technologies” includes—

(A) instrumentation and techniques ranging from sophisticated sensors and software systems to manual sampling and data collection tools that measure, record, and manage spatial and temporal data;

(B) technologies for searching out and assembling information necessary for sound agricultural production decision making;

(C) open systems technologies for data networking and processing that produce valued systems for farm management decision-making; or

(D) machines that deliver information based management practices.

(3) **ADVISORY BOARD.**—The term “Advisory Board” means the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board established under section 1408 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123).

(4) **AGRICULTURAL INPUTS.**—The term “agricultural inputs” includes all farm management, agronomic, and field applied agricultural production inputs, such as machinery, labor, time, fuel, irrigation water, commercial nutrients, feed stuffs, veterinary drugs and vaccines, livestock waste, crop protection chemicals, agronomic data and information, application and management services, seed, and other inputs used in agriculture production.

(5) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a State agricultural experiment station;

(B) a college or university;

(C) a research institution or organization;

(D) a Federal or State government entity or agency;

(E) a national laboratory;

(F) a private organization or corporation;

(G) an agricultural producer or other land manager; or

(H) a precision agriculture partnership referred to in section 414.

(6) **SYSTEMS RESEARCH.**—The term “systems research” means an integrated, coordinated, and iterative investigative process, which considers the multiple interacting components and aspects of precision agriculture systems, including synthesis of new knowledge regarding the physical-chemical-biological processes and complex interactions with cropping, livestock production practices, and natural resource systems, precision agriculture technologies development and implementation, data and information collection and interpretation, production scale planning, production-scale implementation, and farm production efficiencies, productivity, and profitability.

SEC. 412. COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO PROMOTE PRECISION AGRICULTURE.

(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may make competitive grants, for periods not to exceed five years, to eligible entities to conduct research, education, or information dissemination projects for the development and advancement of precision agriculture. Such grants shall be limited to those projects that the Secretary determines are unlikely to be financed by the private sector in the absence of a grant under this section. The Secretary shall make such grants in consultation with the Advisory Board.

(b) **PURPOSE OF PROJECTS.**—Research, education, or information dissemination projects supported by a grant under subsection (a) shall address one or more of the following:

(1) The study and promotion of components of precision agriculture technologies using a systems research approach that would increase long-term, site-specified and whole farm production efficiencies, productivity, profitability.

(2) The improvement in the understanding of agronomic systems, including, soil, water, land cover (including grazing lands), pest management systems, and meteorological variability.

(3) The provision of training and educational programs for State cooperative extension services agents, and other professionals involved in the agricultural production and transfer of integrated precision agriculture technology.

(4) The development, demonstration, and dissemination of information regarding precision agriculture technologies and systems

and the potential benefits of precision agriculture as it relates to increased long-term farm production efficiencies, productivity, profitability, and the maintenance of the environment, and improvements in international trade into an integrated program to educate agricultural producers and consumers, including family owned and operated farms.

(c) **GRANT PRIORITIES.**—In making grants to eligible entities under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Board, shall give priority to research, education, or information dissemination projects designed to accomplish the following:

(1) Evaluate the use of precision agriculture technologies using a systems research approach to increase long-term site-specific and whole farm production efficiencies, productivity, profitability.

(2) Integrate research, education, and information dissemination components in a practical and readily available manner so that the findings of the project will be made readily usable by farmers.

(3) Demonstrate the efficient use of agricultural inputs, rather than the uniform reduction in the use of agricultural inputs.

(4) Maximize the involvement and cooperation of precision agriculture producers, certified crop advisers, State cooperative extension services agents, agricultural input machinery, product and service providers, non-profit organizations, agribusiness, veterinarians, land-grant colleges and universities, and Federal agencies in precision agriculture systems research projects involving on-farm research, education, and information dissemination of precision agriculture.

(5) Maximize collaboration with multiple agencies and other partners that increase leveraging of funds and resources.

(d) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—The amount of a grant under this section to an eligible entity (other than a Federal agency) may not exceed the amount which the eligible entity makes available out of non-Federal funds for precision agriculture research and for the establishment and maintenance of facilities necessary for conducting precision agriculture research.

SEC. 413. RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATION AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION PROJECTS.

Of the funds made available for grants under section 412, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reserve a portion of such funds for grants for projects regarding precision agriculture related to education or information dissemination.

SEC. 414. PRECISION AGRICULTURE PARTNERSHIPS.

In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Advisory Board, shall encourage the establishment of appropriate multi-state and national partnerships or consortia between—

(1) land-grant colleges and universities, State agricultural experiment stations, State cooperative extension services, other colleges and universities with demonstrable expertise regarding precision agriculture, agencies of the Department of Agriculture, national laboratories, agribusinesses, agricultural equipment and input manufacturers and retailers, certified crop advisers, commodity organizations, veterinarians, other Federal or State government entities and agencies, or nonagricultural industries and nonprofit organizations with demonstrable expertise regarding precision agriculture; and

(2) agricultural producers or other land managers.

SEC. 415. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.**—The Secretary of Agri-

culture may not make a grant under section 412 for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility.

(b) **APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and title XVIII of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2281 et seq.) shall not apply to a panel or board created for the purpose of reviewing applications or proposals submitted under this subtitle.

SEC. 416. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated under this subtitle may be retained by the Secretary to pay the administrative costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this subtitle.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds made available under paragraph (a) shall be available for obligation for a two-year period beginning on October 1 of the fiscal year for which the funds are made available.

Subtitle C—Other Initiatives

SEC. 421. HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.

Section 1672 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1672. HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.

"(a) **COMPETITIVE SPECIALIZED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Education, Extension, and Economics Advisory Board, may make competitive grants to support research and extension activities in the high-priority research and extension areas specified in subsection (e).

"(b) **GRANT TYPES AND PROCESS; PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.**—Paragraphs (6), (7), and (11) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) shall apply with respect to the making of grants under this section.

"(c) **MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall require the recipient of a grant under this section to provide funds or in-kind support from non-Federal sources in an amount at least equal to the amount provided by the Federal Government.

"(2) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement specified in paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

"(A) the results of the project, while of particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

"(B) the project involves a minor commodity, deals with scientifically important research, and the grant recipient would be unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.

"(d) **PARTNERSHIPS ENCOURAGED.**—Following the completion of a peer review process for grant proposals received under this section, the Secretary may give priority to those grant proposals found to be scientifically meritorious that involve the cooperation of multiple institutions.

"(e) **HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION AREAS.**—

"(1) **BROWN CITRUS APHID AND CITRUS TRISTEZA VIRUS RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of—

"(A) developing methods to control or eradicate the brown citrus aphid and the citrus tristeza virus from citrus crops grown in the United States; or

"(B) adapting citrus crops grown in the United States to the brown citrus aphid and the citrus tristeza virus.

"(2) **ETHANOL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of carrying on or enhancing research on ethanol derived from agricultural crops as an alternative fuel source.

"(3) **AFLATOXIN RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of identifying and controlling aflatoxin in the food and feed chains.

"(4) **MESQUITE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing enhanced production methods and commercial uses of mesquite.

"(5) **PRICKLY PEAR RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of investigating enhanced genetic selection and processing techniques of prickly pears.

"(6) **DEER TICK ECOLOGY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of studying the population ecology of deer ticks and other insects and pests which transmit Lyme disease.

"(7) **RED MEAT SAFETY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing—

"(A) intervention strategies that reduce microbial contamination on carcass surfaces;

"(B) microbiological mapping of carcass surfaces; and

"(C) model hazard analysis and critical control point plans.

"(8) **GRAIN SORGHUM ERGOT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing techniques for the eradication of sorghum ergot.

"(9) **ANIMAL WASTE AND ODOR MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of—

"(A) identifying, evaluating, and demonstrating innovative technologies for animal waste management and odor control; and

"(B) conducting information workshops to disseminate the results of such research.

"(10) **FIRE ANT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of control, management, and eradication of fire ants.

"(11) **WHEAT SCAB RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section to a consortium of land-grant colleges and universities for the purpose of understanding and combating diseases of wheat and barley caused by *Fusarium graminearum* and related fungi (commonly known as wheat scab).

"(12) **PEANUT MARKET ENHANCEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of evaluating the economics of applying innovative technologies for peanut processing in a commercial environment.

"(13) **DAIRY FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of providing research, development, or education materials, information, and outreach programs regarding risk management strategies for dairy producers and for dairy cooperatives and other processors and marketers of milk.

"(14) **COTTON RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.**—Research and extension grants may be made

under this section for the purpose of improving pest management, fiber quality enhancement, economic assessment, textile production, and optimized production systems for short staple cotton.

“(15) METHYL BROMIDE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of—

“(A) developing and evaluating chemical and nonchemical alternatives, and use and emission reduction strategies, for pre-planting and post-harvest uses of methyl bromide; and

“(B) transferring the results of such research for agricultural producer use.

“(16) WATER QUALITY AND AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of investigating the impact on aquatic food webs, especially commercially important aquatic species and their habitats, of microorganisms of the genus *Pfiesteria* and other microorganisms that are a threat to human or animal health.

“(17) POTATO RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing and evaluating new strains of potatoes which are resistant to blight and other diseases, as well as insects. Emphasis may be placed on developing potato varieties that lend themselves to innovative marketing approaches.

“(18) WOOD UTILIZATION RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing new uses for wood from underutilized tree species as well as investigating methods of modifying wood and wood fibers to produce better building materials.

“(19) LOW-BUSH BLUEBERRY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of evaluating methods of propagating and developing low-bush blueberry as a marketable crop.

“(20) FORMOSAN TERMITE ERADICATION RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of—

“(A) conducting research for the control, management, and possible eradication of Formosan termites in the United States; and

“(B) collecting data on the effectiveness of research projects conducted under this paragraph.

“(21) SWINE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND ODOR CONTROL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of investigating the microbiology of swine waste and developing improved methods to effectively manage air and water quality in animal husbandry.

“(22) WETLANDS UTILIZATION RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of better utilizing wetlands in diverse ways to provide various economic, agricultural, and environmental benefits.

“(23) WILD PAMPAS GRASS CONTROL AND ERADICATION RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of control, management, and eradication of wild pampas grass.

“(24) PATHOGEN DETECTION AND LIMITATION RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of identifying advanced detection and processing methods to limit the presence of pathogens, including hepatitis A and *E. coli* 0157:H7, in domestic and imported foods.

“(25) FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of providing research, development, or education materials, information, and outreach programs regarding financial risk management strategies for agricultural producers and for cooperatives and other processors and marketers of any agricultural commodity.

“(26) ORNAMENTAL TROPICAL FISH RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of meeting the needs of commercial producers of ornamental tropical fish and aquatic plants for improvements in the areas of fish reproduction, health, nutrition, predator control, water use, water quality control, and farming technology.

“(27) SHEEP SCRAPIE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of investigating the genetic aspects of scrapie in sheep.

“(28) ANIMAL WASTE MANAGEMENT AT RURAL/URBAN INTERFACES.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and demonstrating innovative technologies to be used for animal waste management (including odor control) in rural areas adjacent to urban or suburban areas in connection with waste management activities undertaken in urban or suburban areas.

“(29) GYPSY MOTH RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of developing biological control, management, and eradication methods against nonnative insects, including *Lymantria dispar* (commonly known as the Gypsy Moth), that contribute to significant agricultural, economical, or environmental harm.

“(30) DAIRY EFFICIENCY, PROFITABILITY, AND COMPETITIVENESS RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of improving the efficiency, profitability, and competitiveness of dairy production on farms that are heavily dependent on manufacturing uses of milk.

“(31) ANIMAL FEED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purpose of maximizing nutrition management for livestock, while limiting risks, such as mineral bypass, associated with livestock feeding practices.

“(32) FORESTRY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section to develop and distribute new, high-quality, science-based information for the purpose of improving the long-term productivity of forest resources and contributing to forest-based economic development by addressing such issues as forest land use policies, multiple-use forest management, including wildlife habitat development, improved forest regeneration systems, and timber supply, and improved development, manufacturing, and marketing of forest products.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002 such sums as may be necessary to make grants under this section in each of the high-priority research and extension areas specified in subsection (e).

“(g) USE OF TASK FORCES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—To facilitate the making of research and extension grants under this section in a high-priority research and extension area specified in subsection (e), the Secretary may appoint a task force to make recommendations to the Secretary.

“(2) LIMITATION ON COSTS.—The Secretary may not incur costs in excess of \$1,000 in any fiscal year in connection with each task force established under this subsection.

“(3) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and title XVIII of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2281 et seq.) shall not apply to a task force established under this subsection.”

SEC. 422. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 1672 (7 U.S.C. 5925) the following new section:

“SEC. 1672A. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

“(a) COMPETITIVE SPECIALIZED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Education, Extension, and Economics Advisory Board, may make competitive grants to support research and extension activities regarding organically grown and processed agricultural commodities for the purpose of—

“(1) facilitating the development of organic agriculture production and processing methods; and

“(2) evaluating the potential economic benefits to producers and processors who use organic methods; and

“(3) exploring international trade opportunities for organically grown and processed agricultural commodities.

“(b) GRANT TYPES AND PROCESS, PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraphs (6), (7), and (11) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) shall apply with respect to the making of grants under this section.

“(c) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require the recipient of a grant under this section to provide funds or in-kind support from non-Federal sources in an amount at least equal to the amount provided by the Federal Government.

“(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement specified in paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the results of the project, while of particular benefit to a specified agricultural commodity, are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(B) the project involves a minor commodity, deals with scientifically important research, and grant recipient would be unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.

“(d) PARTNERSHIPS ENCOURAGED.—Following the completion of a peer review process for grant proposals received under this section, the Secretary may give priority to those grant proposals found to be scientifically meritorious that involved the cooperation of multiple institutions.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002 such sums as may be necessary to make grants under this section.”

SEC. 423. UNITED STATES-MEXICO JOINT AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Subtitle I of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1458 (7 U.S.C. 3291) the following new section:

“SEC. 1459. UNITED STATES-MEXICO JOINT AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

“(a) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary may provide for an agricultural research and development program with the United States/Mexico Foundation for Science, which will focus on binational problems facing agricultural producers and consumers in the two countries, in particular pressing problems in the areas of food safety, plant and animal pest control,

and the natural resources base on which agriculture depends.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Grants under the research and development program shall be awarded competitively through the Foundation.

"(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—The provision of funds to the Foundation by the United States Government shall be subject to the condition that the Government of Mexico match, on at least an equal ratio, any funds provided by the United States Government.

"(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under this section may not be used for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility."

SEC. 424. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Subtitle I of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1459, as added by section 423, the following new section:

"SEC. 1459A. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) COMPETITIVE GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may make competitive grants to colleges and universities in order to strengthen United States economic competitiveness and to promote international market development.

"(b) PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—Grants under this section shall be directed to agricultural research, extension, and teaching activities that will—

"(1) enhance the international content of the curricula in colleges and universities so as to ensure that United States students acquire an understanding of the international dimensions and trade implications of their studies;

"(2) ensure that United States scientists, extension agents, and educators involved in agricultural research and development activities outside of the United States have the opportunity to convey the implications of their activities and findings to their peers and students in the United States and to the users of agricultural research, extension, and teaching;

"(3) enhance the capabilities of colleges and universities to do collaborative research with other countries, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, on issues relevant to United States agricultural competitiveness;

"(4) enhance the capabilities of colleges and universities to provide cooperative extension education to promote the application of new technology developed in foreign countries to United States agriculture; and

"(5) enhance the capability of United States colleges and universities, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to provide leadership and educational programs that will assist United States natural resources and food production, processing, and distribution businesses and industries to compete internationally, including product market identification, international policies limiting or enhancing market production, development of new or enhancement of existing markets, and production efficiencies.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section."

SEC. 425. FOOD ANIMAL RESIDUE AVOIDANCE DATABASE PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINUATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall continue operation of the Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database program (referred to in this section as the "FARAD program") through appropriate colleges or universities.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the FARAD program, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) provide livestock producers, extension specialists, scientists, and veterinarians with information to prevent drug, pesticide, and environmental contaminant residues in food animal products;

(2) maintain up-to-date information concerning—

(A) withdrawal times on FDA-approved food animal drugs and appropriate withdrawal intervals for drugs used in food animals in the United States, as established under section 512(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(a));

(B) official tolerances for drugs and pesticides in tissues, eggs, and milk;

(C) descriptions and sensitivities of rapid screening tests for detecting residues in tissues, eggs, and milk; and

(D) data on the distribution and fate of chemicals in food animals;

(3) publish periodically a compilation of food animal drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration;

(4) make information on food animal drugs available to the public through handbooks and other literature, computer software, a telephone hotline, and the Internet;

(5) furnish producer quality-assurance programs with up-to-date data on approved drugs;

(6) maintain a comprehensive and up-to-date, residue avoidance database;

(7) provide professional advice for determining the withdrawal times necessary for food safety in the use of drugs in food animals; and

(8) engage in other activities designed to promote food safety.

(c) GRANTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Education, Extension, and Economics Advisory Board, may make grants to colleges and universities to operate the FARAD program. The term of a grant shall be three years, with options to extend the term of the grant triennially.

SEC. 426. DEVELOPMENT AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF NEW BIOBASED PRODUCTS.

(a) BIOBASED PRODUCT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "biobased product" means a product suitable for food or nonfood use that is derived in whole or in part from renewable agricultural and forestry materials.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR BIOBASED PRODUCTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may enter into cooperative agreements with private entities described in subsection (c), under which the facilities and technical expertise of the Agricultural Research Service may be made available to operate pilot plants and other large-scale preparative facilities for the purpose of bringing technologies necessary for the development and commercialization of new biobased products to the point of practical application. Cooperative activities may include research on potential environmental impacts of a biobased product, methods to reduce the cost of manufacturing a biobased product, and other appropriate research.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTNERS.—The following entities shall be eligible to enter into a cooperative agreement under this section:

(1) A party that has entered into a cooperative research and development agreement with the Secretary under section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a).

(2) A recipient of funding from the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Corporation established under section 1658 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5902).

(3) A recipient of funding from the Biotechnology Research and Development Corporation.

(4) A recipient of funding from the Secretary under a Small Business Innovation Research Program established under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

(d) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—To carry out this section, the Secretary may use—

(1) funds appropriated to carry out this section; and

(2) funds available for cooperative research and development agreements (as described in subsection (b)).

(e) SALE OF DEVELOPED PRODUCTS.—The Secretary shall authorize the private partner or partners in a cooperative agreement consistent with this section to sell new biobased products produced at a pilot plant under the agreement for the purpose of determining the market potential for the products.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 427. THOMAS JEFFERSON INITIATIVE FOR CROP DIVERSIFICATION.

(a) INITIATIVE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide for a research initiative (to be known as the "Thomas Jefferson Initiative for Crop Diversification") for the purpose of conducting research and development, in cooperation with other public and private entities, on the production and marketing of new and nontraditional crops needed to strengthen and diversify the agricultural production base of the United States. The initiative shall include research and education efforts regarding new and nontraditional crops designed—

(1) to identify and overcome agronomic barriers to profitable production;

(2) to identify and overcome other production and marketing barriers; and

(3) to develop processing and utilization technologies for new and nontraditional crops.

(b) PURPOSES.—The initiative is established—

(1) to develop a focused program of research and development at the regional and national level to overcome barriers to development of new crop opportunities for farmers and related value-added enterprise development in rural communities; and

(2) to ensure a broad-based effort encompassing research, education, market development, and support of entrepreneurial activity leading to increased agricultural diversification.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF INITIATIVE.—The Secretary shall coordinate the initiative through a nonprofit center or institute that will coordinate research and education programs in cooperation with other public and private entities. The Secretary shall administer research and education grants made under this section.

(d) REGIONAL EMPHASIS.—The Secretary shall support development of multi-State regional efforts in crop diversification. Of funding made available to carry out the initiative, 50 percent shall be used for regional efforts centered at land-grant colleges and universities in order to facilitate site-specific crop development efforts.

(e) ELIGIBLE GRANTEE.—The Secretary may award funds under this section to colleges or universities, nonprofit organizations, or public agencies.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—Grants awarded through the initiative shall be selected on a competitive basis. The recipient of a grant may use a portion of the grant funds for standard contracts with private businesses, such as for test processing of a new or nontraditional crop.

(2) TERMS.—The term of a grant awarded through the initiative may not exceed five years.

(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—The Secretary shall require the recipient of a grant awarded through the initiative to contribute an amount of funds from non-Federal sources at least equal to the amount provided by the Federal Government.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 428. INTEGRATED RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an integrated research, education, and extension competitive grant program to provide funding for integrated, multi-functional research, education, and extension activities.

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the appropriation of funds to carry out this section, the Secretary may award grants to colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404(4) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(4))) on a competitive basis for integrated research, education, and extension projects in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(c) CRITERIA FOR GRANTS.—Grants under this section shall be awarded to address priorities in United States agriculture, determined by the Secretary in consultation with the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board, which involve integrated research, education, and extension activities.

(d) MATCHING OF FUNDS.—

(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—If a grant under this section is to the particular benefit of a specific agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall require the recipient of the grant to provide funds or in-kind support to match the amount of funds provided by the Secretary in the grant.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement specified in paragraph (1) with respect to a grant if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the results of the project, while of particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

(B) the project involves a minor commodity, deals with scientifically important research, and the grant recipient would be unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002 to carry out this section.

SEC. 429. RESEARCH GRANTS UNDER EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LAND-GRANT STATUS ACT OF 1994.

The Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382; 7 U.S.C. 301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section—

“SEC. 536. RESEARCH GRANTS.

“(a) RESEARCH GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make grants under this section on the basis of a competitive application process (and in accordance with such regulations that the Secretary may promulgate) to a 1994 Institution to assist the 1995 Institution to conduct agricultural research that addresses high priority concerns of tribal, national, or multi-state significance.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Grant applications submitted under this section shall certify

that the research to be conducted will be performed under a cooperative agreement with at least one other land-grant college or university (exclusive of another 1994 Institution). ”

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002. Amounts appropriated shall remain available until expended.”

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. ROLE OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE REGARDING FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall be the principal official in the executive branch responsible for coordinating all Federal research and extension activities related to food and agricultural sciences.

SEC. 502. OFFICE OF PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY.

(a) OBJECTIVE.—The establishment of an Office of Pest Management Policy pursuant to this section is intended to provide for the effective coordination of agricultural policies and activities within the Department of Agriculture related to pesticides and of the development and use of pest management tools, while taking into account the effects of regulatory actions of other government agencies.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE; PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in the Department of Agriculture an Office of Pest Management Policy, which shall be responsible for—

(1) the development and coordination of Department of Agriculture policy on pest management and pesticides;

(2) the coordination of activities and services of the Department, including research, extension, and education activities, regarding the development, availability, and use of economically and environmentally sound pest management tools and practices;

(3) assisting the Department in fulfilling its responsibilities related to pest management or pesticides under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-170; 110 Stat. 1489), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), or other law; and

(4) performing such other functions as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary.

(c) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—In support of its responsibilities under subsection (a), the Office of Pest Management Policy shall provide leadership to ensure coordination of interagency activities with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and other Federal and State agencies.

(d) OUTREACH.—The Office of Pest Management Policy shall consult with agricultural producers that may be affected by pest management or pesticide-related activities or actions of the Department or other agencies as necessary in carrying out the Office's responsibilities under this section.

(e) DIRECTOR.—The Office of Pest Management Policy shall be under the direction of a Director appointed by the Secretary who shall report directly to the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 503. FOOD SAFETY RESEARCH INFORMATION OFFICE AND NATIONAL CONFERENCE.

(a) FOOD SAFETY RESEARCH INFORMATION OFFICE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a Food

Safety Research Information Office at the National Agricultural Library. The Office shall provide to the research community and the general public information on publicly funded, and to the extent possible, privately funded food safety research initiatives for the purpose of—

(A) preventing unintended duplication of food safety research; and

(B) assisting the executive and legislative branches of the Government and private research entities to assess food safety research needs and priorities.

(2) COOPERATION.—The Office shall carry out paragraph (1) in cooperation with the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, public institutions, and on a voluntary basis, private research interests.

(b) NATIONAL CONFERENCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall sponsor a conference to be known as the “National Conference on Food Safety Research”, for the purpose of beginning the task of food safety research prioritization. The Secretary shall sponsor annual workshops in each of the subsequent four years after the conference so that priorities can be updated or adjusted to reflect changing food safety concerns.

(c) FOOD SAFETY REPORT.—With regard to the study and report to be prepared by the National Academy of Sciences on the scientific and organizational needs for an effective food safety system, the study shall include recommendations to ensure that the food safety inspection system, within the resources traditionally available to existing food safety agencies, protects the public health.

SEC. 504. NUTRIENT COMPOSITION DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall update, on a periodic basis, nutrient composition data.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

(1) the method the Secretary will use to update nutrient composition data, including the quality assurance criteria that will be used and the method for generating the data; and

(2) the timing for updating the data.

SEC. 505. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS RECEIVED OR COLLECTED ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL ARBORETUM.

Section 6(b) of the Act of March 4, 1927 (20 U.S.C. 196(b)), is amended by striking “Treasury” and inserting “Treasury. Amounts in the special fund shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, without further appropriation.”

SEC. 506. RETENTION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE PATENT CULTURE COLLECTION FEES.

All funds collected by the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the acceptance of microorganisms for deposit in, or the distribution of microorganisms from, the Patent Culture Collection maintained and operated by the Agricultural Research Service shall be credited to the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the Patent Culture Collection. The collected funds shall be available to the Agricultural Research Service, without further appropriation or fiscal-year limitation, to carry out its responsibilities under law (including international treaty) with respect to the Patent Culture Collection.

SEC. 507. REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED UNDER SHEEP PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ACT OF 1994.

Using funds available to the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Service may reimburse the American Sheep Industry Association for expenses incurred by American Sheep Industry Association between February 6, 1996, and May 17, 1996, in preparation for the implementation of a sheep and wool promotion, research, education, and information order under the Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

SEC. 508. DESIGNATION OF KIKA DE LA GARZA SUBTROPICAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER, WESLACO, TEXAS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal facilities located at 2413 East Highway 83, and 2301 South International Boulevard, in Weslaco, Texas, and known as the Subtropical Agricultural Research Center, shall be known and designated as the “Kika de la Garza Subtropical Agricultural Research Center”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Kika de la Garza Subtropical Agricultural Research Center”.

SEC. 509. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE EMPHASIS ON IN FIELD RESEARCH REGARDING METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES.

It is the sense of Congress that, of the Agricultural Research Service funds made available for a fiscal year for research regarding the development for agricultural use of alternatives to methyl bromide, the Secretary of Agriculture should use a substantial portion of such funds for research to be conducted in real field conditions, in particular pre-planting and post-harvest conditions, so as to expedite the development and commercial use of methyl bromide alternatives.

SEC. 510. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-BASED AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Education should collaborate and cooperate in providing both instructional and technical support for school-based agricultural education.

SEC. 511. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT CRISIS MANAGEMENT TEAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Department of Agriculture plays a crucial role in ensuring that the United States is a world leader in maintaining the most affordable, abundant, wholesome, and safe food supply for its citizens.

(2) It is in the best interest of consumers, producers, processors, retailers, government officials, and other interested parties to ensure that any crisis that may affect the operation of the Department or the production of a safe and wholesome food supply is addressed in an effective manner.

(3) Unforeseen circumstances, including natural disaster, personnel management problems, threats to public health, and trade disruptions, have the potential to undermine the operation of the Department and the Nation's ability to efficiently provide a safe, affordable, abundant, and wholesome food supply.

(4) Department of Agriculture employees, consumer confidence, and the food production sector have been adversely impacted as a result of the challenges associated with Federal agencies' ability to respond to incidents in a coordinated and timely fashion.

(5) An effective response to crises, emergencies, and similar situations depends upon the timely and efficient coordination of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

(6) It is in the best interests of the Nation to ensure that whenever a crisis occurs the appropriate Federal agencies coordinate their activities.

(7) The Department of Agriculture should take the lead in ensuring a safe and wholesome supply of food for the Nation because of its broad and diverse relationship with consumers and the food production sector.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should—

(1) designate a Crisis Management Team within the Department of Agriculture, which would be composed of senior departmental personnel with strong subject matter expertise selected from each relevant agency of the Department and would be headed by a team leader with strong management and communications skills;

(2) upon establishment of such a Crisis Management Team, direct that the Crisis Management Team—

(A) develop a department-wide crisis management plan, taking into account similar plans developed by other government agencies and other large organizations;

(B) develop detailed written procedures for implementing the crisis management plan;

(C) conduct periodic reviews and revisions of the crisis management plan and procedures;

(D) ensure compliance with crisis management procedures by departmental personnel;

(E) coordinate the Department's information gathering and dissemination activities concerning issues managed by the Crisis Management Team;

(F) ensure that all employees of the Department are familiar with the crisis management plan and procedures and are encouraged to bring information regarding crises or potential crises to the attention of team members;

(G) ensure that departmental spokespersons convey accurate, timely, and scientifically sound information that is easily understood by the target audience; and

(H) cooperate and coordinate with other Federal agencies, States, local governments, industry, and public interest groups; and

(3) seek to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal departments and agencies that have related programs or activities to help ensure consistent, accurate, and coordinated dissemination of information throughout the executive branch in the event of a crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2534, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997. In doing so I would like to offer my gratitude and congratulations to three of my colleagues who serve on the Committee on Agriculture; first, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], who chairs the Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation and Research; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the committee's ranking minority

member; and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation and Research. These three gentleman have shown a deep commitment to the importance of agricultural research and to America's farmers and ranchers, and we would not be here today, Mr. Speaker, were it not for their fine efforts.

After several subcommittee hearings, this bill, which passed the Committee on Agriculture by unanimous vote on Wednesday, October 29, is the first comprehensive overhaul of agricultural research programs since 1977. The last 2 decades have brought sweeping changes to agricultural trade, production and Government's approach to agriculture, culminating in the reforms accomplished in the last session of Congress commonly called the freedom to farm bill.

Today agricultural research is more important than ever in transforming to a market economy, in securing new markets for American farm products overseas, and ensuring that we continue to produce the world's highest quality food and fiber at competitive prices.

Consider for a moment the tremendous successes we have achieved as a result of agricultural research. The boll weevil has been virtually eliminated throughout the American South as a result of highly successful research programs. Throughout the Southern States, cotton production has been restored to profitability benefiting not just farmers who grow cotton, but American textile manufacturers and consumers who depend upon high-quality American cotton.

Agricultural research is also yielding new genetically modified organisms with great potential for American farmers, consumers and our environment. BT corn, which incorporates pesticide properties at genetic levels, allows farmers to combat corn root rot and corn borers without applying additional pesticides. Round-Up ready soybeans, which are resistant to common herbicide, allow Round-Up to be applied to the plant.

In each instance agricultural research has yielded better crops that save farmers and consumers money and allow for less application of pesticides and herbicides on the farm.

As I have the pleasure to recount to many foreign government officials with whom I met recently, these genetically modified organisms, which are the result of agricultural research, give the United States a real and distinct competitive advantage in the international marketplace. These and other advances indicate agricultural research's enormous potential for the farmer, the consumer and the environment.

H.R. 2534 lives up to this challenge. In addition to reauthorizing numerous agricultural research programs through the year 2002, the bill includes reform provisions to ensure peer and

merit review of all USDA and U.S. research programs, provides for greater accountability in the development of Federal research priorities, and greater dependence on cost-sharing through requirements for matching funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reauthorization to the full House with two technical amendments. First, as a result of jurisdictional concerns, section 231 of the bill is removed, which would have authorized the Secretary to establish a national agricultural weather information system. Second, a new section which has been added to the bill which names the Subtropical Agricultural Research Center in Weslaco, TX, after our former colleague and chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable Kika de la Garza.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended, the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997. I am pleased to report that this bill is the result of a bipartisan effort in the House Committee on Agriculture and incorporates suggestions from both the providers and the users of agricultural research.

The bill, as amended, will provide for the continuation of our Nation's historic commitment to agricultural research and productivity. It was through this commitment that our Nation developed an agricultural sector that is the undisputed technological leader of the world. Our commitment to agricultural research has allowed us to produce more food on less land. As a result producers have the option of devoting environmentally sensitive land to other uses.

Among the provisions of this bill, as amended, is language to do the following: Increase merit review of federally funded agricultural research and extension, improve mechanisms for feedback from users of agricultural technology, and expand open competition for grant funds. In addition, we have included in the committee reported bill a provision that was inadvertently left out in the committee which would rename the Weslaco Agricultural Research Station as the Kika de la Garza Subtropical Agricultural Research Center.

H.R. 2534, as amended, stretches every Federal dollar by directing many grant programs to require matching funds from non-Federal sources. Additionally, this legislation places new emphasis on genetics and biotechnology, research cooperation and the development of new crops.

As we look toward a future with greater reliance on international competition and exports, it is even more critical that we maintain our Nation's leadership in agricultural research.

The modest reforms and the priorities in this legislation will help to ensure continued U.S. leadership in both agricultural research and production well into the next century.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 2534, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation and Research of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2534, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997, and I, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], would like to thank several of my colleagues as well, certainly beginning with the chairman of the committee Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], ranking member on the subcommittee, for their work and cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor. This bill has been a bipartisan effort from the start, and I have enjoyed working with all parties involved.

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over ag research programs, I held four hearings this summer to hear testimony from researchers who are involved in ag research, and farmers and others who the research is intended to benefit. We attempted to craft this bill to reflect some of their recommendations. This bill also reflects many recommendations of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is critical that we maintain a strong public and private research effort in order for American agriculture to continue to be profitable and competitive in the global economy of the future. It is not by accident that Americans enjoy the most abundant and affordable supply of food and fiber of any country in the world. More people are fed and clothed today from crops grown with increased efficiency and limited resources. Research efforts have led to a sixfold increase in agricultural productivity over the last 4 decades. Almost 50 years ago the number of people fed by 1 farmer was 15. Today 1 farmer is able to feed 96 other people. Research into farming techniques and improved seed nutrition and nutrients have underwritten the success story of American agriculture.

Further, agricultural research is even more critical to support growing populations in the areas of the world which suffer from malnutrition. World demand for food is expected to double by the year 2025.

I have said from the start that all the components of our ag research system do an excellent job and are to be commended for their hard work. However, in today's farm policy and budget environment, it is very critical that we en-

sure that the Government maintains a strong role in ag research to support our farmers and ranchers. I have approached this reauthorization effort with a goal of striving to improve current research efforts and accomplish more with the same or fewer dollars than we have had in the past. This will require research to be conducted in the most efficient manner possible and avoid any duplication of efforts.

□ 1315

This bill accomplishes some good and necessary reforms. Frankly, I would have liked to have accomplished even more reform in some of our research programs, but this bill represents the will of our subcommittee and the will of the full committee, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the chairman of the subcommittee which had jurisdiction, and thank him for his work and his willingness to work with myself and other members of the minority to putting forth, I think, a research bill, H.R. 2334, which really is going to position this country to move forward to ensure that the U.S. agriculture is on the leading edge of technology.

Just last year when we modified and made major changes in our farm programs, where we were moving Government more and more out of the business of farming, we are going to be requiring our farmers to be relying more on the marketplace in order to achieve their financial benefits.

This change in our farm policy is going to require an even greater investment in research, because all of us in agriculture fully understand that we are, in fact, in an international marketplace and the only way we can be competitive is by being on the leading edge of technology.

Thus, the investments that we make in agriculture research are ensuring that our farmers will have the tools to assure they can be competitive, to assure they can be profitable.

This bill embodies what I think are some modest reforms in our agriculture research program. It ensures we will have greater participation by stakeholders to participate. It will ensure that the research grants that are being offered will be subject to greater peer review and merit review. It will ensure that we maintain an infrastructure through our land grant colleges and other educational institutions that can provide us with the highest quality in agriculture research.

Importantly also, it moves forward in a new area of providing the authorization for funding for the plant genome research program. I think all of us understand the benefits that can be derived not only to agriculture but to

consumers and our economy by further understanding the intricacies and opportunities with plant genome research.

There is more that can be done though, and I hope we will find a way that we can ensure that even greater competition on the allocation of our Federal dollars occurs so we can assure that our taxpayers get the greatest return from the Federal investment they are making in agriculture research.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate the time.

What I am rising to say is, this is a good bill coming out of the House of Representatives. I appreciate the fact that we have had a lot of cooperation and the ability to work together with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

However, I do want to say that the companion bill in the Senate is a problem. It creates \$1.2 billion in entitlement spending, and we will certainly want to watch what happens. What the outcome of the conference will be is important, because I think this is a misuse of the process and it is an abuse of this particular category of bill.

Mr. Speaker, we will take a long hard look and see what the Senate comes up with. Maybe we can twist a few ears over there.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I also want to compliment the bipartisan leadership that brought this bill forward, and particularly the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

I also want to speak to the value of the research components, both in the research area and the extension area, and some of the expansion of education programs, not only those that are reauthorized, but some of the new initiatives and new ways of ensuring not only that we have a new reform but that we include new research items.

Particularly I am interested in bringing to your attention the inclusion of *pfisteria*. That has indeed been a troublesome bacteria that has plagued our waterways, both our fish and human areas. I am also appreciative in the land grant colleges, that there was the opportunity for the 1890 colleges to participate.

However, I have a concern. I have the concern that there is the potential, not through the bill we have passed, indeed, I voted for that bill and will en-

courage people to vote for this one as well, but in the conference activity. I hope that we do not attempt to use that savings, all of that savings, not to go for food needs of hungry people, particularly those persons for food stamps who were denied food stamps through the welfare reform. A lot of people are suffering out there; also food stamp mothers who need those programs.

The potential of using \$1.3 billion away from that, I think, is far too much. So I am urging the conferees not to allow that to happen. I support this bill, and I look forward to voting for the bill, I look forward to voting for the conference report that certainly has a better distribution of moneys coming from food stamps, savings from food stamps. It should not be dissipated out of that area; it should be included in that area.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Speciality Crops of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2534, the Agricultural Research Extension and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first comprehensive overhaul of agricultural research programs in 20 years. I think that is quite an achievement. The legislation is a critical step forward in meeting the increased demand for food in our world.

The bill improves the ability and capacity of participants in the U.S. food and agricultural sector to meet consumer needs for high-quality, safe, nutritious, affordable, and convenient food and other agricultural products and services.

The bill also will help American producers, the farmers of America, produce in a global market and compete. Innovative and meaningful research is vital to ensure that the United States remains at the forefront of producing the world's highest quality food.

This bill creates many exciting new programs; for instance, the Food Genome Research Initiative, which is fundamental in developing new and improved uses of crops, improving their productivity and efficiency, and generating high-quality, safe, and more affordable food products.

H.R. 2534 also establishes an Animal Waste Management Research Initiative, which will help address waste disposal issues faced by both the farm community and urban interests as well. Agricultural research continues to play a critical role in spurring our Nation's expanding economy. This legislation will help keep it that way for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], our chairman; the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. STENHOLM]; the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY]; and, of course, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], for the fine work they have done on this legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2534, the Agricultural Research Extension and Education Reauthorization Act. I would like to thank the hard work that others have mentioned of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the subcommittee chair; of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] on our side; of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]; and our chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH]. It is a great day for Willamette, Mr. Chairman.

Frankly, if you thank these people, you have got to thank their staffs, because they are the ones that have done such hard work on this important piece of legislation. It is not only important to America, but it is certainly important to California agriculture.

The farmers in my district are the most productive specialty crop growers in the world. They produce \$2.5 billion worth of fresh row crops, vegetables, and horticultural crops each year. Mr. Speaker, I represent not only the salad bowl, but the flower bowl of the country. The agriculture industry is the backbone of the communities in my district, and they do this without Federal price supports.

This is a highly competitive field of agriculture. Research is one of the few ways that the Federal Government can help my farmers. I feel this legislation will help not just my farmers but all the farmers to be competitive into the next century.

I especially want to bring to your attention the language that I offered that was adopted in the markup that will greatly affect some of the farmers in my district and others in other parts of the country.

A high priority in the field of research is in the form of extension grants which will expedite the development of alternatives to methyl bromide. A fundamental change in the manner research is conducted in the Agricultural Research Service will help to avert the possible negative impacts on the American production as research will be directed to areas of greatest need as the phaseout date gets closer.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also contains an initiative for organic farming that will help this niche market continue to grow. We have barely begun to tap the full potential of the organic farming systems. This initiative will provide grants to facilitate the development of organic agriculture production, processing, and potential economic benefits associated with both domestic and foreign markets.

As we go to conference, I would like to echo the words stated earlier on the issue of the food stamps. We need to restore the food stamps, particularly to the children that have been affected and cut off by them. I am confident my colleagues will recognize the merit of this issue, and I look forward to their support.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and certainly his great work in the whole agriculture field across this country; and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], for his wonderful work; and the other members and staff.

I have no objection to this bill, certainly, going forward at this point, but I just want to say that I hope we are all perfectly clear that this budget-neutral bill will go to a conference with the Senate measure, S. 1150, that contains over \$1.2 billion in new spending, offset by savings from prohibiting States from double-billing the Federal Government for food stamp administrative costs.

I do not have a problem with the offset, but it is, nevertheless, a huge amount of money coming out of the food stamp program. I understand that some of these funds may be needed for agriculture programs. However, in the final conference agreement, it is imperative that a substantial amount of savings be used to address what is perhaps the most pressing hunger problem facing the country today, and that is the need to restore food stamp benefits to the very poor refugees and legal immigrant families with children, especially those not receiving any SSI.

There is a strong consensus on this point among the religious community, the antihunger community, and the immigrant community. So it will be difficult to support a final conference agreement that does not put a substantial amount of the Senate bill's administrative savings back into feeding hungry people, in particular vulnerable groups of legal immigrants and refugees who lost access to food stamps and now face real hardship.

I think many of my colleagues will be with me, hopefully, in sharing this view. I do know just in food in general, being at an emergency food bank in my hometown of Dayton, OH, food is down across the country in almost every food bank and warehouse across this land. We really need to address this issue in a better way, and I hope we can do it through this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2534, the agricultural research reauthorization bill. I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH]; the gentleman from Texas, [Chairman COM-

BEST]; and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], and the committee staff for their hard work on this important bill.

I am particularly pleased that this bill includes the essential part of legislation that I authored, the Precision Agricultural Research Education and Information Dissemination Act.

Several new technologies make up precision agriculture. These include global positioning satellites, digital field mapping, grid soil sampling, and the list continues to grow as technology develops. If our farmers are to remain the most productive and most efficient growers and producers in the world, precision technology must be made available to them. This technology is just as revolutionary as moving from the horse to the tractor or from the plow to conservation tillage.

□ 1330

Let us not deny our farmers the opportunity to remain the best in the world, and I urge my colleagues to bring our farmers into the 21st century by voting yes on this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his excellent work in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of a growing number of folks on both sides of the aisle who are caught in a very delicate situation. We feel good about the bill before us and terrified of what may be coming out of the Senate in a conference report, and trying to figure out how best to deal with this situation and how best to begin to send a message here today that that has to be dealt with and dealt with carefully.

We are concerned about the food stamp issue, and that is an issue that makes us the most nervous.

With that in mind, I would like to respectfully inform my colleagues that I will be calling for a recorded vote on this bill in the hope that that will begin a conversation to ensure that our fears will not be founded when it comes back from the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] a member of the committee.

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I stand in the well today to encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2534, the Research and Extension Reauthorization Act. The bill fulfills a commitment the Republican Congress made over 2 years ago to our Nation's farmers and ranchers. In return for a more market-oriented Federal farm policy, Congress would enact a more farmer-friendly Tax Code and increase our investment in agriculture research as we head into the 21st century.

The Federal Government must continue to lead the way in market devel-

opments and in finding new ways to utilize America's grown products.

Mr. Speaker, upon passage today, we will have delivered on our promises.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the chairman of the subcommittee, who I know was here earlier, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], the ranking member, who I also see in the Chamber, for their leadership on this important issue, and also the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the committee.

Strong agricultural research programs have enabled America's farmers and ranchers to produce the highest quality food and fiber in the world at competitive prices. H.R. 2534 updates and modernizes our research programs so that American farmers will maintain their competitive edge in an increasingly global market. From the start, I was committed to passing an agricultural research bill that does more with our research dollars in an ever-increasing tight budget environment.

This country has for many years been referred to as the "breadbasket" to the world. We could not talk about America and her greatness without first acknowledging the role that the family farm has played, and we are the most productive country in the world. The family farm is largely responsible for these unprecedented accomplishments.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill. We had the good fortune of having folks from our community in the agriculture research lab testify and offer testimony, and our home community of Peoria has an agriculture research lab and benefits immensely, as well as the University of Illinois, and I encourage all Members to support this important legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support today of the Agriculture Research Extension and Education Reauthorization Act of 1997. As has been said by others, we are moving into a new era in agriculture, and research is going to be a more and more important component of our agriculture policy in this country. We in the upper Midwest and particularly in the northern part which I represent are very concerned about some specific issues with scab on wheat and barley where we have a cooperative effort in this bill to start putting more of a focus on that particular issue, and that is something we are very interested in, along with all of the other parts of this legislation.

I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], the ranking member of the subcommittee, and also the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the

full committee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the ranking member of the full committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can move it ahead and see if we can get a conference on this and pass this into law.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for allowing me to speak on a bill that they have worked very hard on and has lots of good merits. I think the House bill should be passed, as is, by both bodies. I do not feel that way about the potential Senate bill, and even though I have not seen or read the Senate bill in its entirety, I have a lot of concerns about what is coming out of the Senate side of this bill.

Making research mandatory, for example, puts research funding at the tune of \$780 million on the same level with Social Security, VA payments, Medicare and Medicaid, and unlike making a decision to postpone research on certain kinds of plants and animals, one cannot postpone payments on Social Security, and I do not think that the Senate bill is right in trying to make research mandatory.

I also have concerns about the \$300 million Fund for America, which would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to have a pot of money that could be used to reward or punish friends and enemies accordingly. I do not think that is a proper thing, that we need to put more politics in it.

I am also concerned about what this bill could do in terms of an unfunded mandates to Medicaid to our States. I have a lot of concerns about it, but I do want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, I think the House bill is the model which we need to pass. I do not think the Senate bill is. I am very concerned that the Senate took a good and proper fundamental use of taxpayers' money and a fundamental jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, and they have politicized it.

What I urge our Members to do as this bill goes to conference is to stick to our guns; do not accept the Senate bill, do not accept the Senate amendments, do not increase spending, do not increase unfunded mandates, and do not create more mandatory entitlement programs.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I want to say, just in a general way, that I appreciate the work that the chairman of the committee has done on this bill in moving it forward. I think it is basically a good bill and I would like to see it enacted.

Now, I have heard, as apparently others have, that there are some problems having to do with the Senate bill, and

I am sure the gentleman has heard some of these; in fact, I think I heard some remarks just as I was walking in with regard to that, and I would earnestly like to ask the chairman to give full consideration to this, because if we have a situation in which the Governors, as I understand they have continued to find objections to this, and a large number of our welfare agencies have objections to the Senate language, it is going to cause some difficulty, as the gentleman would know, for many of the Democrats to vote for the bill. I want to see this bill passed very solidly, as the gentleman knows.

So I would just call that to the gentleman's attention, and if he can in any way ameliorate the impact of that Senate language, why, it would be very much appreciated by me and I am sure by many others on this side, and we will see if we cannot emerge with a bill that we can all support and which I know will be good for agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers on this side, and I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The controversy that has been talked about on both sides of the aisle concerning the Senate bill will have to be resolved in conference, as all legislation is resolved in conference. Getting us to the floor today was not an easy endeavor, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], the ranking member, and all members of their subcommittee did an excellent job of resolving some very, very strong differences; and as they have stated, they were not totally satisfied with their work, as I would agree with them, but they have done the best they could do. I commend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the full committee, for his leadership in bringing us to this point.

Now we are asking our colleagues in the House to join with us in passing this bill so that we might go to the Senate and resolve those issues, of which there are several. But one of which I would speak particularly to is the administrative cost of the food stamp program of \$1.25 billion. Those moneys, and the Senate has agreed, those dollars should be reserved for the Committee on Agriculture to be spent on food, hunger, nutrition.

I happen to agree very strongly myself with the comments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], but there are differences of opinion in this, and I believe we can work them out in a conference.

Yes, the States are very opposed to this. They would much rather control the expenditure of those funds, if there are any funds there, which also has yet to be resolved. I understand that. But I would hope that all of our colleagues in this body would stay with the House Committee on Agriculture and with the Senate on this provision and work it out in a satisfactory way.

I particularly want to acknowledge, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] did earlier, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], that we have had a very good working relationship on this bill between the appropriators on the House side and the House Committee on Agriculture. That is something that we have not had as good a relationship in years past as we now have.

I will just say in concluding that this Member will do everything on our part, working with Members on my side on appropriations and on the Committee on Agriculture, to work in the conference to see that we satisfy a majority of the House Members in resolving this issue. I would hope that all of our colleagues would join with us today in passing this legislation at this moment today so that we might get to that conference and work those out in the same spirit of cooperation that has brought us here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this. This bill has nothing to do with the criticism that we have heard from several Members. This bill, as we call it, is a very clean reauthorization bill of the research title, which has not been reauthorized for some many years now. The subcommittee and the full committee I think found that there were few differences on this bill, but when there were, we resolved them so that we will have unanimous support from both Democrats and Republicans from the Committee on Agriculture, and as we should from this House of Representatives, because we were very careful to make sure that Members' concerns were answered in committee, as we have always done.

This committee, my colleagues will find, if they have not found already, is very concerned about its bipartisan-ship, and it is very concerned about bringing regions of this great Nation together on agriculture, which we have been very successful in doing. And here again, we come before the House with a unanimous effort.

Now, the issues that have been discussed indeed are very difficult issues. Any time there is \$1.25 billion at stake, Members become very anxious about where they are spent, how they are spent, and on which priorities they may be spent. We hear all of those concerns.

The conference committee will be made up of Republicans and Democrats, most of whom we see here today. So Members' concerns have been heard, and our job now is to try to sit down in this very short time with the Senate and see if there is any way that we can take care of the concerns that we have in the House and complement them with the Senate.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is an important position that we take now. There is about 2.8

billion dollars' worth of research here that is authorized, reauthorized. It is essential to this Nation if we are indeed going to be competitive throughout the world.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2534, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act for 1997.

I have had the opportunity to meet with farmers, producers, and processors from northeast Indiana, as well as Dean Vic Lechtenberg of Purdue University's School of Agriculture. They have emphasized that the excellent research and extension education system of our land grant universities and the USDA has allowed U.S. agriculture to provide the lowest cost and highest quality food supply in the world.

As you know, agriculture is an extremely important industry, not only to my home State of Indiana, but many other parts of the country as well.

In the 1996 farm bill, we made great strides in bringing agriculture production into a new era of technological competitiveness. As American agriculture relies more on world markets, it is imperative that its technology and human resources continue to be strong.

Without superb technology and an outstanding education system, U.S. producers and processors will be unable to compete effectively with other nations where labor and other costs are less.

There is little doubt that our agricultural industry will need the necessary tools to compete in the global market with technology based research.

The passage of this legislation will provide State cooperative extension service systems and State university agricultural research programs the necessary tools to help direct this country in the future and allow it to continue to be a world leader in agriculture.

As we work toward making sure that our Nation's books are balanced, we must not do so at the expense of a safe, dependable, and abundant food supply.

We simply must maintain agricultural research and funding at adequate levels to ensure that American agriculture can remain competitive. For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING TACTILE CURRENCY FOR BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 122) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding tactile currency for the blind and visually impaired.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 122

Whereas currency is used by virtually everyone in everyday life, including blind and visually impaired persons;

Whereas the Federal reserve notes of the United States are inaccessible to individuals with visual disabilities;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act enhances the economic independence and equal opportunity for full participation in society for individuals with disabilities;

Whereas most blind and visually impaired persons are therefore required to rely upon others to determine denominations of such currency;

Whereas this constitutes a serious impediment to independence in everyday living;

Whereas electronic means of bill identification will always be more fallible than purely tactile means;

Whereas tactile currency already exists in 23 countries worldwide; and

Whereas the currency of the United States is presently undergoing significant changes for security purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) endorses the efforts recently begun by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to upgrade the currency for security reasons; and

(2) strongly encourages the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to incorporate cost-effective, tactile features into the design changes, thereby including the blind and visually impaired community in independent currency usage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has a very noncontroversial purpose, which intends to update our currency to include tactile markings. This is a change which I believe will be certainly of value to all Americans.

It is important to recognize the efforts of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in this general area of improvement. As our currency is constantly updated for security purposes, a new low-vision feature has been added in the form of a high-contrast, large numeral denoting the denomination of the bill. This change is already helping many Americans with vision difficulty.

House Resolution 122 takes these efforts one step further by initiating the

incorporation of tactile marking in our currency. This relatively minor change will have significant impact not only on individuals who have vision problems, but on all Americans that are visually impaired.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman LEACH and subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] for their support and assistance with the resolution; also, the ranking member, the gentlemen from New York, Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. FLAKE for their support and courtesy in facilitating this.

I also want to express my appreciation to the American Academy of Ophthalmology and the National Federation of the Blind for their technical assistance in drafting this proposal.

I want to mention in connection with this resolution that I am particularly pleased to have worked with the Federation. They have been a leading force in our country in helping all of us acquire a more rational understanding of blindness. That has certainly been the case as we worked together on this particular matter. The Federation notes that although the visually impaired are currently able to use and handle their money, this additional step will facilitate safer and more secure transactions.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we examine and move forward in designing different forms of currency for use in the decades ahead. In that process, it will be important to consult with experts who have relevant knowledge, such as those in the Federation. This will ensure that the conversion of our currency occurs in a manner that is both cost-conscious and beneficial to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER]. To the extent that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing can accommodate the visually impaired during the future redesigns of currency, it should do so.

The availability of technology and materials exist today to do a great number of things with respect to the issue of anticounterfeiting. I would hope that the same technology may be used to make our visually impaired citizens more comfortable in their everyday business transactions.

Indeed, we have seen at newsstands and stores there have been technological advances which have allowed those who are salespersons and others to be able to function, even though they are, in many instances, visually impaired. It is only right that we give this opportunity to all of the citizens of this Nation. It is right, it is fair, it is appropriate.

I also recognize that we must not diminish the general market acceptance of our currency. Therefore, I would not

expect radical designs under the resolution which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER] has presented. Nevertheless, I support the idea and the effort of this well-intentioned resolution.

I would hope that this body would see fit to pass it, because I think it is the right thing to do for those of our citizens who are visually impaired and can benefit greatly by our response to their needs today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for his courtesies and support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 122.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' CEMETERY PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 813) to amend chapter 91 of title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for theft and willful vandalism at national cemeteries.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 813

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Cemetery Protection Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. SENTENCING FOR OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY AT NATIONAL CEME- TERIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide a sentencing enhancement of not less than 2 levels for any offense against the property of a national cemetery.

(b) COMMISSION DUTIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Sentencing Commission shall ensure that the sentences, guidelines, and policy statements for offenders convicted of an offense described in that subsection are—

(1) appropriately severe; and
(2) reasonably consistent with other relevant directives and with other Federal sentencing guidelines.

(c) DEFINITION OF NATIONAL CEMETERY.—In this section, the term "national cemetery" means a cemetery—

(1) in the National Cemetery System established under section 2400 of title 38, United States Code; or

(2) under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the

Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCollum. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 1532, the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act, on June 23, 1997. The legislation instructed the Sentencing Commission to review and amend its guidelines to provide a sentencing enhancement for any offense against property of a national cemetery.

Under the House approach, the Sentencing Commission was directed to increase a sentence by at least four levels if property of the national cemetery was injured or defaced, and by at least six levels if such property was stolen or unlawfully sold.

The Senate recently passed S. 813, which is the bill before us today, its version of the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act, with an amendment. The Senate version differs slightly from the House-passed version. It directs the Sentencing Commission to increase the penalties for these crimes by at least two levels, not the four- and six-level enhancements which the House bill required.

Although I am somewhat disappointed that the Senate has chosen to lower the enhancement levels, I am heartened by the fact that the Senate version still retains a specific direction to the Sentencing Commission to increase penalties. Moreover, the Senate-passed bill also contains language which instructs the Commission to carefully review its entire sentencing structure regarding these crimes and ensure that penalties are appropriately severe.

By passing this legislation, the U.S. Congress sends a clear message to criminals who would desecrate or destroy property at a national cemetery that the United States will not tolerate such disrespect of its veterans. Such cowardly crimes can only be perpetrated by persons who choose to ignore the sacrifice of those men and women who have served proudly and bravely in the U.S. Armed Forces.

This issue strikes a national nerve, and I am grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] for his dedication and concern for our veterans. As the prime sponsor of this bill, and I am going to recognize him in a minute, he deserves a lot of applause.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for his continued efforts to ensure the passage of this legislation. The House version, H.R. 1532 was introduced on May 6, 1997, just over 6 months ago, and today the bill has 250 cosponsors.

Many of our veterans gave their lives to protect our cherished traditions and freedoms, and when their gravesites are desecrated by foul words and pictures, it offends the dignity and sense of honor shared by all Americans. I can think of no better gift to give our Nation's heroes for this Veterans Day than to pass the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act, and underscore our intolerance of vandalism and theft at our national cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will impose stiffer penalties for thefts and acts of vandalism that involve a national cemetery. When someone desecrates a gravesite or steals a headstone, that is an especially vile crime, especially vile when it is a national cemetery where heroes of the United States are buried. It deserves appropriate punishment. So I commend the authors of this bill. I hope it will become law soon. I urge unanimous adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], the author of this bill on the House side.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the time has finally come. For over a year I have worked hard to introduce a certain piece of legislation which I think overcomes all our differences, goes beyond party affiliation, and shows the American people that when all is said and done, that this Congress is one, that it can be united.

Today especially as we go into Veterans Day weekend, and Tuesday, November 11, as Members know, is Veterans Day, I cannot think of any legislation which comes at a more appropriate time than that of the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act, introduced with my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. Speaker, whenever a young man or woman enters the military, which some do voluntarily, they do so in order to protect our country and guard us against the uncertainties of the world. Sometimes they make the ultimate sacrifice. Over 1 million Americans have died fighting this country's wars. That is why it sickens me when I hear of ingrates and degenerates desecrating our national cemeteries.

In June of 1996, Riverside National Cemetery in California, the second largest in the Nation next to Arlington Cemetery in Virginia, fell prey to a

thief who stole bronze markers from 128 graves, and later sold them for a profit. Horribly, this theft was discovered on Fathers Day by family members who had come to pay their respects.

On April 19 vandals spray-painted racist and profane words on cemetery walls at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii, located in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The Veterans Cemetery Protection Act would stiffen criminal penalties for theft and malicious vandalism at cemeteries. S. 813, the companion bill to my H.R. 1532, as amended, would stiffen criminal penalties for theft and malicious vandalism at national cemeteries.

S. 813 will require the U.S. Sentencing Commission to review and amend the sentencing guidelines to enhance penalties resulting from national cemetery desecrations and theft. The bill ensures that the sentences, guidelines, and policy statements for the offenders convicted of an offense are appropriately severe and reasonably consistent with other relevant directives and with other Federal sentencing guidelines.

S. 813 seeks to protect the 114 VA national cemeteries, along with other cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of Interior.

Joseph Frank, National Commander of the American Legion, stated, "Deliberate acts of vandalism against the final resting place of American fallen comrades must not be tolerated." According to the Paralyzed Veterans of America News, "Demeaning and degrading the final resting place of veterans who have made the ultimate sacrifice for the Nation and their loved ones strikes at all veterans and all Americans." This bill addresses their concerns.

The Veterans Cemetery Protection Act has received the endorsement and support of numerous veterans and military organizations. I wish to recognize and thank the men and women of the Noncommissioned Officers Association of the United States of America, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the American Legion, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Blinded Veterans Association, AmVets, and others who have expressed their support for this legislation.

Let there be no doubt, this is the Congress' gift to them and those who have gone before them. I wish to thank over 245 Members of this House of Representatives who have cosponsored this bill.

I would especially like to thank the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABER-

CROMBIE] and his staff members, Lee-Ann Adams and Vivian Wolf for their support and leadership on this issue, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and his staff member, Nicole Nason, for their help and guidance in making S.813 a reality; to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and his staff for passing this measure out of the Committee on the Judiciary in an expeditious manner; and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and his floor staffer, Siobhan McGill, for their help in bringing S.813 to the floor; and to my own staff, especially Nelson Garcia, who led on this issue.

I would like to thank my fellow colleagues from the Inland Empire, the gentlemen from California, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. BONO, for their help in the early stages of this bill. Being so close to Veterans Day, I solemnly ask my colleagues to put all our differences aside, accept Senate bill, S. 813, and pass the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act.

Let this be a gift of Congress to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, despite the subject matter, which I am sure the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] has explicated very clearly, this is in fact a happy day. That is to say that with the passage of the bill today, the Senate bill, S. 813, we will have addressed a very, very serious matter in a timely fashion, which is to say that the President will have the opportunity, hopefully, to sign this bill, perhaps as early as Veterans Day, upcoming Veterans Day.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today then to urge my colleagues to support passage of S. 813, the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act, as amended by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] and I first introduced this bill in the House, and I am happy that we were able to work with the Senate to bring their version to the floor today for passage.

As I indicated, it is appropriate that we are able to take up this bill as Veterans Day approaches. This bill instructs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to significantly increase criminal penalties for theft and willful vandalism at national cemeteries.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT],

who gave me the opportunity to work with him on this requisite piece of legislation. It has indeed been a pleasure to work with him, and I am pleased that together we have been successful in our effort to move this bill through Congress.

□ 1400

I might say as well, Mr. Speaker, that I have had an opportunity to work with the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] as the ranking member on his subcommittee and the Committee on Resources previous to this, and it has been an extraordinarily enjoyable time for me, legislatively and personally, to be associated with him.

I would also like to sincerely thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] for recognizing the need for this legislation and for working with us, the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] and myself, and giving us their support in moving this issue forward. The gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] has been extraordinarily patient in this endeavor, and I very much appreciate it.

I would likewise like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], who has also made a significant contribution to this bill, and I would like to extend my personal gratitude to him. I have had the opportunity to work with him in other areas as well, juvenile justice for one. And I appreciate the opportunity to extend to him my personal congratulations in helping to get this forward and extend to him my personal thanks.

On April 19, 1997, Mr. Speaker, seven Oahu cemeteries on the Island of Oahu in the State of Hawaii, including the National Cemetery of the Pacific at Punchbowl and the Hawaii Veterans Cemetery, were vandalized. Vandals used red spray paint to write racist and profane words on grave markers and cemetery and chapel walls. It is obvious that nothing is, in fact, sacred to the people who committed this act. Strict penalties must be enacted to send the message that we will not allow this type of behavior to continue unchecked.

As we have heard from the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], this was not the only desecration of a national cemetery to occur in the country. Unfortunately, this type of crime is on the rise. On May 18, 1997, the New Jersey National Cemetery was also vandalized just prior to Memorial Day. These acts are an insult to the veterans who gave their lives to ensure our freedoms and to their families. Further, it is an affront to all men and women who have served or are presently serving in our Nation's Armed Forces.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, but it is entirely a propos that, unfortunately, just yesterday, and I arrived a little too late to know whether the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] entered this into the RECORD, but there

was a Scripps Howard News Service story just yesterday, "Vandalism Rising At Veterans Cemeteries." Coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, of course, to the passage of the bill today, but very pertinent in terms of asking the Members to support it. The story says, in part, "Lawmakers hope President Clinton will sign the bill into law on Veterans Day, on Tuesday."

I want to indicate that under the sentencing guidelines which I mentioned, in case it has not been made a part of the RECORD, it gives guidelines to the judges, directing them to increase the penalties for convictions of theft and vandalism at the national cemeteries. The measure before us would set prison terms for up to 10 years for anyone convicted of vandalism causing more than \$1,000 damage and up to 15 years for thefts at the national cemeteries.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by indicating that today we are voting to send that message that we will not forget the sacrifices made by those who made the ultimate sacrifice and that we will not tolerate further desecration of our Nation's cemeteries.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

This bill tightens penalties for any offense against properties of national veterans' cemeteries. Current statutes do not include any sentencing guidelines for theft, vandalism, or desecration of national cemeteries, only generic provisions against damaging Federal property.

In the wake of several incidents of theft, vandalism, and desecration, as has been enumerated by our colleagues today, at national cemeteries last year in California, Hawaii, New Jersey, and other States, I think it is appropriate that we penalize those who have perpetrated these acts of crime to deter this kind of reprehensible behavior. We owe no less to those who gave so much for all of us.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to join in support of this worthy measure.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 813.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN LEGION INCORPORATION TECHNICAL CORRECTION

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1377) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion to make a technical correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to Incorporate the American Legion", approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285; 36 U.S.C. 45) is amended by striking "December 22, 1961" and inserting "February 28, 1961".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1377, the Senate bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. PEASE. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1377. This is a very simple bill. The purpose of the bill is to expand the American Legion membership eligibility dates for Vietnam-era veterans. It merely changes the dates within the confines of the American Legion Charter.

Under this bill, the commencement date of the Vietnam Conflict in the American Legion Charter will be defined as February 28, 1961, instead of the current date, which is December 22, 1961. February 28 is the date that United States Army advisers first accompanied South Vietnamese troops on patrols.

This modification tracks strictly the dates which the Veterans Administration uses in awarding benefits to Vietnam veterans. I wish to emphasize that the bill even changes the American Legion Charter and has no effect on any benefits paid to Vietnam veterans or any other effect. This bill will have no cost.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has adequately explained this bill. It is a very simple bill. It does something we certainly should do, to enable those American veterans who served in the Armed Forces after February 28, 1961, when the first American troops accom-

panied South Vietnamese troops on patrol, but prior to December 22, 1961, which is the current date in the current legislation in the incorporating charter of the American Legion, to enable them to join the American Legion. This does track the change Congress made for veterans' benefits. I hope that this bill is unanimously approved.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of S. 1377, the American Legion Membership Eligibility Act, which changes the date from which those persons may qualify for veterans' benefits through association with their service during the Vietnam war.

At present, anyone in the service on or before December 22, 1961, qualifies. This bill modifies that date of eligibility to February 28, 1961, and in so doing, codifies the Veterans Administration practice of using the earlier dates and expands the number of veterans eligible for various benefits and for membership in the American Legion.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation, which provides eligibility assistance to our veterans who served in the Vietnam war and who seek recognition by the American Legion.

I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for yielding me the time. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of S. 1377. I have introduced an identical bill, H.R. 2835, which expands the Vietnam-era eligibility dates for membership in the American Legion. It is very significant that the House is voting on this veterans bill on the eve of November 11th, Veterans Day. Hopefully this great Nation can remember its veterans throughout the year, not only in November. The American Legion, founded September 16, 1919, is a great service organization and is well deserving of our full support. I urge a favorable vote on this important legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1377.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVING CANCELLATIONS
TRANSMITTED BY PRESIDENT
OCTOBER 6, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2631) disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105-45.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of cancellations 97-4, 97-5, 97-6, 97-7, 97-8, 97-9, 97-10, 97-11, 97-12, 97-13, 97-14, 97-15, 97-16, 97-17, 97-18, 97-19, 97-20, 97-21, 97-22, 97-23, 97-24, 97-25, 97-26, 97-27, 97-28, 97-29, 97-30, 97-31, 97-32, 97-33, 97-34, 97-35, 97-36, 97-37, 97-38, 97-39, 97-40, and 97-41 as transmitted by the President in a special message on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105-45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution of disapproval of the President's line item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

I would first like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] for their leadership on this resolution. They are the ones who initiated the resolution, and without them it would not be possible for us to have this debate and action today.

Many of us have different reasons, Mr. Speaker, for supporting this resolution. First, some of us, myself included, are strong supporters of the line item veto. I continue to be even though we are asking for this disapproval resolution to be passed. This group may have the best reason of all to support this resolution of disapproval.

The President must use this new power very carefully, fairly, and responsibly. Otherwise, the line item veto becomes an abusive and dangerous power in the hands of the President.

□ 1415

Second, those strongly opposed to giving this power to the President in the first place and have argued that it is unconstitutional, you should vote for this resolution on principle alone. Your reasoning? The President should not have the line-item veto power in the first place and therefore he should not use it in this instance.

Third, some of us have had to explain to our service men and women back

home why their needs have been found less important than those of others and why they will not be getting the help they need this year. If you have any military construction projects in your State, and most States do, you should vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what category each of our Members would fall into, they should share the responsibility to ensure that the President uses his new authority fairly, carefully, and responsibly. The line-item veto authority can only be effective if it is used properly to cut wasteful and unneeded spending. This resolution is being considered in this House today because the President used his line-item veto authority in this instance carelessly and casually and then admitted that he made several mistakes.

Congressional Quarterly reported on October 31 the following: "The White House issued a veto threat, even as it acknowledged that it had used erroneous data as the basis for striking 18 of the 38 projects from the law."

In the White House press briefing shortly after the veto, OMB Director Franklin Raines said these exact words: "I believe that the great majority, if not the overwhelming majority, of these projects can make a contribution to our national defense."

Mr. Speaker, the fact is our committee did not pork up the appropriations bill, and because of that this administration is finding it harder and harder to defend its cancellations. My subcommittee produced a responsible and frugal bill. There is not a single project in the bill that was not completely scrubbed and carefully scrutinized by my committee, the authorizing committee and the Pentagon. Each and every project included was done with the full support and endorsement of the Defense Department. The facts are each of these projects meet a validated military requirement. Each of these projects is executable in this fiscal year, and this bill is within the amounts provided for defense under the budget agreement signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, nobody should claim that this bill contains unnecessary spending or is laden with pork. In fact, the contrary is true. Let me remind my colleagues that the bill we produced this year was \$610 million less than last year's enacted level. This is a 7 percent cut. Out of an \$11.2 billion budget level 2 years ago, the fiscal year 1998 appropriations bill is \$2 billion less. That reduction is over 20 percent in 2 years. The fact is if every other spending bill in the Congress was cut proportionately, we would not only have a balanced budget right now but a surplus of several billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, when the President finds wasteful and unnecessary spending, he has now the authority to cancel that spending, and he should use it. But when the President uses this power to cancel spending not because it is wasteful but for political or other rea-

sons, Congress should exercise its authority to disapprove of his actions. Today this Congress has the opportunity to correct the mistakes the President has admitted making.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee that authored the appropriations bill, I now ask my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval not just to provide the much needed resources for our service men and women but to ensure that the line-item veto power is used fairly, carefully, and responsibly in the future. The entire Republican and Democratic leadership team supports this resolution of disapproval. I strongly urge every Member of this body to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, let me at this time also thank some of the very key people that have been so instrumental not only in the movement of this bill but also of helping us in this resolution of disapproval. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, we have worked very closely with him; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], all of them have helped me. But more than anyone else, of course, is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member and the former chairman of this subcommittee. He has been absolutely remarkable in his efforts to put together a good bill and to also help us to get bipartisan support in this resolution of disapproval. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the ranking member of the authorizing committee, also was very important in helping to craft and work with us on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak about this particular bill. I was chairman of this subcommittee for quite a few years. In many instances we would pass this bill on a voice vote. We have prided ourselves in being a very bipartisan subcommittee. I would be remiss if I did not say that I think we have the finest staff on both sides, Democrats and Republicans, the finest staff anywhere in this House. They have done a remarkable job year after year after year to make sure that these projects are scrubbed, to make sure that there are no lightning rods in these bills. We have made a real effort to do the best that we could for our troops, our men and women in the service, and to help our Nation's defense by having people that would resign and reup and keep our military strong, and to keep our families intact where they would have a decent place to live and exist.

I would say the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] made my speech. I had a nice speech here. I would be happy to send all the Members copies. But I would say this. I have the privilege of serving on two committees. I

serve on the Subcommittee on Military Construction that I was chairman of for a lot of years. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I have been very good friends for many years. I would say that I do not know of a finer, more dedicated Member in this House than the gentleman from California.

I also serve on the Subcommittee on National Security. I can equally say the same thing for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] who has been instrumental in adding health issues into the defense budget and a remarkable person in his own right. If we had the camaraderie in all the House that we have on this Subcommittee on Military Construction, I think life would be a little more pleasant for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should not have been vetoed. I did not support the line-item veto. When the line-item veto bill was up, I stood in this well and I predicted what would happen on the line-item veto. I stick by those predictions. This is just the first part of the terrible things that can happen under line-item veto. I think some of my colleagues that voted for line-item veto would have a tendency to rethink at this point in time. This is a good bill. There are no lightning rods in it, there is no Lawrence Welk, there are no bicycle paths. This is a bill that stresses the quality of life for our men and women in service and training facilities.

The argument that was made that some of these projects were not ready to go, we have prided ourselves in making sure that any project that we fund would be ready to go in that fiscal year. For that reason, I strongly support the override of this bill and compliment the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], all the Members on the Democratic side, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and all the staff for putting this bill together. I would strongly urge a unanimous vote on overriding this veto.

Let me make one other point. In talking to people, they have said, "Well, I voted for line-item veto. I feel a little bit hypocritical about voting to override one of the first line items that was passed here." When Members signed up to support line-item veto, they did not sign up to support every time that a President, be he Democrat or Republican that would veto, they signed up to give the President some discretion to scrub the bills and make sure that there was no pork and waste in them. I do not think it is a bit hypocritical for anyone that supported line-item veto to support the override of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that everybody vote with us on overriding this line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a certain sameness or similarities between what each of us that have worked so hard on these bills have to say, I think. I think that is because there has never probably in the history of the Congress been two appropriation/authorization committees that have worked closer together or have worked in a more bipartisan spirit than these committees have. I appreciate from the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] so much the ability for us to work together like we have. We had the same criteria. We worked hard on that criteria. We struggled to make sure that everything absolutely met that criteria. I think we were all absolutely dumbfounded when the President chose to veto these particular bills.

Let me sum it up again. All of these projects would address validated requirements of the military services. We did not invent any of these projects. We did not come up out of our head and say, "Oh, that would be nice to do." These are things we demanded that the military prove their need for before we put them in. They are based on information provided by the military departments when the legislation was being developed. All of the projects are executable in 1998—33 of the 38 canceled projects, 85 percent of them, are actually in the President's 5-year defense program. One in four were programmed by the administration for the fiscal year 2000 military construction program. The military construction appropriations and authorization bills were both within the limits established by the budget agreement. There is no wasteful or excessive spending here.

The White House and the Department of Defense both admit mistakes were made in the exercise of the line-item veto on the military construction propositions bill. To keep faith with the men and women in uniform and to improve their working conditions, their training environments and to enhance unit readiness, I believe the House should override the President's vetoes in this case.

The Line-Item Veto Act provides a process for reconsideration. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] said, innate in supporting the line-item veto, and I supported the line-item veto and I still support it, but innate in that process is the ability of this body to disagree with what the President's thoughts were by vetoing them. That is what I ask us to do today. Let us disagree with the President. The President and the White House have already admitted mistakes were made. I do not think he is out there struggling for Members to sustain this veto particularly. Let us band together and have a very strong vote to override these vetoes.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House in the last 2 years has offered more amendments to cut military spending than I have. I think that we spend an obscene amount on military spending. I think it ought to be cut back deeply. Last year I offered an amendment to this bill to cut a number of projects out which were not on the administration's 5-year plan. I had originally expected to oppose this resolution because I felt that justice might best be served by making the White House and the Congress live with the consequences of their action on the line-item veto. But I think the manner in which the White House has handled these line-item vetoes in recent weeks is an affront to responsible government and deserves the type of public repudiation that this resolution provides. It is true that Members of Congress sometimes add items to legislation that are inconsistent with the overall purposes of that legislation and items that serve purposes too narrow to warrant the use of public funds. The same I would say can be said of many of the proposals contained in each of the budgets of each of the six Presidents I have served under.

The question which the line-item veto raises was whether or not wiser decisions about the use of public funds could be made if the executive were given significant additional powers with respect to Government spending. I believe the experience we have had with the Clinton White House this fall answers the question. The President's exercise of the line-item veto has been objectionable for the following reasons in my view.

□ 1430

First, staff incompetence. With respect to military construction, the first appropriation bill on which the line item was fully exercised, fully one-third of the projects vetoed failed to meet the criteria established by the White House in the first place.

Second, executive arrogance. The criteria established by the White House displayed wanton disregard for the constitutional role of the Congress in making decisions about spending. They were not narrow-purpose items, they were of limited public use. In fact, the overwhelming majority were contained in the administration's own 5-year construction plans. The purpose of the veto, therefore, was clearly a matter of insisting on administration priorities in spending over those of the Congress. The White House may want the Government to work that way, but the Founding Fathers did not.

Third, political dealmaking. The White House has made it very clear from the outset that its use of the line-item veto is a matter of political discretion rather than objective policy. The Defense appropriation bill which contained nearly half of all discretionary spending and, in my view, more

than half of the items that might have demanded the most scrutiny in an objective application of the line-item veto, that bill was the subject of the first administration offer with regard to the line-item veto. On that bill conferees were told by the White House that they would exempt the defense appropriation bill from line-item vetoes altogether if the Congress added more money to fund the very questionable Dual Use Program which gives Government research grants to private for-profit corporations.

Fourth is the blatant disregard for eliminating the most wasteful items. While the White House has at times been willing to exercise the line-item veto on items where a clear public purpose was beyond dispute, they willfully neglected to use the veto in numerous instances where lack of a clear public purpose was beyond dispute.

What we clearly have here is an effort on the part of the White House to leverage greater political power to the executive branch carried on under the guise of imposing fiscal restraint. But what the executive branch wants under this administration is no different than we have seen under previous administrations. They not only want more power, but they also very often want more money. And line item vetoes are being used to leverage in some cases more spending and to give the executive branch more leverage on non-spending items as well. I believe that is illegitimate.

The President is the most powerful office in the world, and as Americans we should be proud of that, but the President should not be too powerful. We elect him to be a President, not a king. In my lifetime the greatest abuse of powers of government have come from the executive branch. If the Congress does not maintain its constitutional responsibility to be a coequal branch of Government, we risk having a Government which increasingly abuses its own citizenry and in which decisions about policy and resources are dominated by unelected staff elites or only marginally subject to popular will.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate the statement that the gentleman from Wisconsin just made.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. SKEEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the passage of H.R. 2631, the military construction line-item veto disapproval bill. Passage of this legislation is necessary to correct the mistakes that were made during the President's vetoes of 38 projects included in

the bill which passed the House by a wide margin in July and in September.

I thank the leadership for allowing this bill to come to the floor for passage, and I am especially appreciative of the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member, for their work in shepherding this legislation on the floor.

One of my colleagues from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has titled this bill the military construction line-item integrity bill as this legislation restores integrity to the line item-veto process by ensuring the decisions are made on the basis of fact and not mistakes. The Office of Management and Budget has acknowledged that mistakes were made which led to the President's line-item vetoes, and passage of the legislation would allow those mistakes to be corrected.

This bill has broad bipartisan support, and just yesterday the National Guard Association of the United States endorsed this bill. So I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support the legislation to ensure that our laws are based on factual information, not mistakes and erroneous information.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion of disapproval and commend the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and others for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2631, the military construction veto disapproval. I have the privilege of representing Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, TX. One of the 38 projects stricken from the military construction projects was in my district so I have a very personal interest in this legislation, but I believe that the President made the decision to strike many of projects in the bill based on poor advice and inaccurate information.

One of the reasons the President gave for vetoing these projects was that they did not meet a so-called "quality of life" requirement. I don't know what the President's definition of quality of life is, but I do know this: these 38 projects which were eliminated included facilities to provide a safe working place for the men and women we entrust with the defense of our Nation.

In the case of the squadron operations facility to be built at Dyess Air Force Base, there are currently no existing facilities to house the 13th Bomb Squadron. Without this facility, the men and women of the 13th Bomb Squadron will be denied the tools they need to do their jobs.

How does this add to their quality of life or their ability to discharge their duties? Quality of life involves a great deal more than housing and child care facilities and gymnasiums, although those are very important. I cannot imagine how the quality of work life could be

much worse than importing 500 to 1,000 men and women to do a job without any facilities in which to house that work.

The projects line-item vetoed by the President were included in the military construction bill because they are essential to the mission of our military. Most of these projects were included in the 5-year plans of the military services so that the money for these projects will be spent eventually. These projects were considered by four different congressional committees with expertise in the area of national security and were reviewed by the Pentagon. The House and the Senate voted by overwhelming majorities to approve the Military Construction Appropriation Act.

Yet the President and his staff acting in haste crafted a new criteria for military construction projects—quality of life. While I do not oppose the use of quality of life as a consideration for determining the merit of a project, it should not be the only criteria, and it should be clearly defined and fairly applied. In the case of the 13th Bomb Squadron Operations Facility and many of the other projects canceled by the President, it was not. The President incorrectly substituted his judgment for that of the Congress and the Pentagon. I urge my colleagues to support our men and women in uniform by voting to override the President's line-item veto to restore these projects.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], who has done yeoman work on this bill and also on the authorization bill.

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support H.R. 2631, the Military Construction Line Item Veto Integrity Act before this House today. As my colleagues know, we have done so much work these last few months. We have had some very interesting hearings trying to address the needs that we address when we had those hearings and included in the bills and in some of these items that were vetoed.

Now, the administration has admitted that they made some mistakes when they line item vetoed some of these projects. This is why today I strongly request my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

As my colleagues know, during these hearings that we had in reference to the military construction appropriations bills and the authorization bill, we traveled, and we saw the need. I wonder if my colleagues know that some of our pilots are getting out of the military after they serve 5, 6 years, and after we pay a million dollars to train our pilots they get out, and do my colleagues know why? It is because we have housing problems that now we are beginning to address in this bill today.

They tell me, as my colleagues know, we train, and then we are deployed two, three different times a year, and at the same time when we are fighting to keep peace in these countries where we are assigned, we have to worry about our families. Why? Because the

plumbing does not work, because the electricity does not work, and then we expect our service people to stay when they have to serve under these conditions. They get better job offers in the outside.

But let us not forget that included in this bill also, there is a pay raise for service men and women who serve, as my colleagues know, in the military.

Again, I want Members to also remember that this has to lead back on pension. We will one of these days regret that because we did not do what the servicemen, people, needs were never addressed, that they are going to be getting out of the military, and this is going to cost more money.

This is why I urge my colleagues to vote to override this bill today. It is a good bill, it is good for America.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to commend the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and all the others who have worked on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say that I rise in strong support of this resolution to disapprove the President's line-item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

I rise in strong support of the resolution to disapprove the President's line-item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

Congressman SKEEN and I introduced resolutions disapproving the line-item veto of these 38 military construction projects. One of those projects—the construction of two vehicle maintenance shops totaling \$9.9 million—was to be built at Fort Campbell, KY, located in my congressional district.

But whether or not you have a project eliminated by this veto should not be your only concern.

What should concern you is the process.

Under the provisions of the Line Item Veto Act, the disapproval resolution is the only means we have to register our objection or dissatisfaction with the programs or projects targeted for elimination or the manner in which they were selected. I am very pleased that Chairman PACKARD and Ranking Member HEFNER support us in this effort.

Depending on which report you read, as many as 18 projects proposed for elimination in this line-item veto proposal should never have been included on the list, including the vehicle maintenance shops at Fort Campbell.

As a matter of fact, in testimony before the House National Security Committee on October 22, 1997, Maj. Gen. Clair F. Gill, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Budget, testified that the Fort Campbell project is 90-percent design complete, not zero percent as had been reported to the President. Since the President used the design status to determine which projects should be eliminated, he acted based on erroneous information. The bottom

line is a mistake was made, and the vehicle maintenance shops at Fort Campbell should not have been included in the list of vetoed projects.

I voted to give the President line-item veto authority, and I still believe it is an appropriate means to further reduce unnecessary spending.

But the decisions on which projects or programs should be eliminated should be based on the criteria defined in the line-veto message. That did not happen in this case.

Two units at Fort Campbell are scheduled to receive the new vehicle maintenance shops. The 235 soldiers assigned to those units currently work in facilities constructed over 50 years ago that were built to last for only five years. They are too small and improperly designed for efficient and safe maintenance activities. They have old and faulty electrical wiring which caused a fire in October 1991, destroying one building; they have inoperable and unserviceable vehicle exhaust systems; and they have inadequate lighting and are combustible. The current buildings contain asbestos and lead-based paint and they have no oil/water separators. Any way you look at it, the current maintenance facilities are deficient from an environmental, safety, and operational standpoint.

The soldiers who work in these buildings are responsible for repairing and maintaining 400 pieces of equipment each month. The work they perform is critical in terms of maintaining a premier fighting force like the 101st Airborne Division which is expected to fully deploy to any location throughout the world in only 76 hours.

Please join Congressman SKEEN and me in support of the disapproval resolution. The Senate has already voted 69 to 30 to reject this veto, and the House must take similar action. We need to protect the line-item veto process, and we need to restore funds to projects which met the President's criteria and did not belong on any veto list.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong support of this legislation and suggest to my colleagues that this issue is not solely about 38 projects, as meritorious as those projects may be. It is about the proper balance between the Congress of the United States and the Executive.

I did not support the line-item veto. I supported the enhanced rescission alternative of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], which allowed the President to take out projects that the President thought were either fraud or wasteful or untimely or against the policy of the administration.

In this instance the administration acted far too broadly and far beyond those constraints. This legislation, therefore, in my opinion, seeks to address balancing the responsibilities of this Congress, which under article I of the Constitution of the United States is to set the policies for this Nation and the executive's authority to carry out, but also to ensure that those policies are perceived by the administration as not to be wasteful or against

policy. In my opinion, this veto went so broadly as to substitute the judgment of the administration for that of the Legislature, and that is not appropriate under the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues not just because these 38 projects themselves have merit, but more importantly so that the proper balance between the executive and legislative branches of Government is focused upon by both the administration and by the Congress, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for his leadership and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for his leadership in bringing this matter before the Congress in a context which does not need to be critical of the administration, but simply to say as we try out this new procedure, and it is brand new, we need to make sure that we do so in a context that is judicious and proper.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

(Mr. CRAPO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this Line Item Veto Cancellation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me and I rise to express my support for H.R. 2631, the Line Item Veto Cancellation Act.

As a long-time supporter of the line-item veto, I was particularly disappointed to see the President make a misinformed decision in canceling funding for 38 military construction projects, including 2 in my home State of Idaho. Based on faulty and outdated information provided by the Department of Defense, President Clinton eliminated needed funds for a B-1B bomber avionics facility for low-altitude navigation and an F-15C squadron building for planning and briefing combat crews at Mountain Home Air Force Base.

Both of these projects were among the Air Force's top priorities and were a part of the President's 1999 and 2000 Pentagon budgets. The 366th Composite Wing at Mountain Home Air Force Base represents one of our Nation's premier rapid-deployment forces in times of an emergency. Even Defense Secretary Cohen has reflected on the critical role of the 366th Wing in our national security structure and acknowledged that "it must maintain peak readiness to respond rapidly and effectively to diverse situations and conflicts." For service at home and in the Middle East, Central America, and Europe, the men and women of Mountain Home Air Force Base have answered the call of their country; it is only right and proper that the Commander-in-Chief recognize this important commitment.

Providing the President with line-item veto authority was an important goal of the last Congress, and I was pleased to assist in that effort. However, this power is significant and must be practiced with great care and attention. It is my hope that the President understands this and will only exercise the veto in appropriate cases.

At this time, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman PACKARD, Representative SKEEN, Representative HEFLEY, and the

House leadership on both sides of the aisle for considering this measure today to overturn the President's vetoes. The Senate has already voted overwhelmingly to overturn the President's actions, so I hope that we can also send a strong message to the White House this afternoon by passing this measure with a veto-proof majority.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I voted for the line-item veto in 1995, and I remain a strong supporter of it when it is used properly. Unfortunately that is not the case here.

Now we have two problems. Problem one, the President vetoed worthwhile projects, not the kind of wasteful pork-barrel spending that we intended to eliminate with the line-item veto; and problem two, the administration now admits it vetoed dozens of projects by mistake. Now they say they want to work with Congress to restore the funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to correct these mistakes, and that is through this override process. When the President vetoes worthwhile projects by mistake, we have an obligation and a responsibility to correct those mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I voted for the line-item veto in 1995, and remain a strong supporter of it when it is used properly. Unfortunately, that is not the case here.

We have two problems. First, the day after the President used the line-item veto, his budget director said this about the vetoed projects:

"The great majority, if not the overwhelming majority, of these projects can make a contribution to our national defense."

Problem 1. He vetoed worthwhile projects, not the kind of wasteful, pork-barrel spending we intended to eliminate with the line-item veto.

Problem 2. The Administration now admits it vetoed dozens of projects by mistake. They say they want to work with Congress to restore funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to correct these mistakes and that is through this override process.

When the President vetoes worthwhile projects by mistakes, we have an obligation and a responsibility to correct those mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of this bill.

I rise today in support of this bill to restore the military construction projects which were vetoed from the military construction appropriations bill.

Although I was not a Member of Congress when the line-item veto authority was passed and I do not necessarily support the line-item veto which I believe unfairly shifts the balance

of power in this government, I understand that the purpose of the line-item veto is, basically, to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary spending—pork.

The projects included in the military construction bill were not pork. As a Member of the House National Security Committee's Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Installations, I know how well each of the projects was vetted. All projects had to meet a need of the military and construction had to begin before the end of the next fiscal year. Even the Pentagon knows how important these projects are because most were included in its outyear budget plans.

When the President used his line-item veto on the military construction bill, his criteria included:

1. That the project could not make an immediate contribution to quality of life, or
2. That the project could not begin in fiscal year 1998.

First, in regards to the ability to begin construction in fiscal year 1998, both the military construction appropriations and authorizing subcommittees reviewed all the projects closely and verified with the military services that construction on each project could begin next year. The administration also has now admitted projects were vetoed based on incorrect information.

Second, many members of the House National Security Committee, including myself, find odd that the criteria did not include safety of our men and women in uniform and our civilian personnel. Many of the projects vetoed were, in fact, included in the original military construction bill for safety reasons.

For example, Congress has included an ammunition supply area to be located on McGregor Range at Fort Bliss. The soldiers of Fort Bliss fire live ordnance on McGregor Range which is about 20 miles from the main post. Some of the live ordnance is now stored on the range, however, much is still stored on the main post and must be transported to the range for use by the troops. On post, the ammunition is stored in buildings which do not comply with regulations designed to protect human safety and the environment. To deliver the ammunition to the range, soldiers transport the ordnance over public highways through low income and minority areas of El Paso.

Another project included in the bill for safety reasons is a project to renovate launch complex facilities on White Sands Missile Range. Our soldiers and civilians, currently working in this launch complex, are testing, among other munitions, antiballistic missiles to protect our troops in the field and the people of this nation. The 200 men and women who perform these tests, however, are working in unsafe and generally deplorable conditions. They face daily hazards relating to the absence of fire suppression systems and are potentially exposed to the dangerous hanta virus because of rat infestation under the buildings. Without the renovations to the launch complex, their health and safety are at risk and activities relating to many of this nation's future offensive and defensive weapon systems will be jeopardized.

I urge you to vote yes on this bill to help protect the lives and health of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilian personnel.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as an appropriator and opponent of the Line-Item Veto Act, my comments will be somewhat counterintuitive.

You bet there is a mistake that needs to be corrected here. It was our mistake in passing the Line-Item Veto Act.

You bet we should be concerned for the prerogatives of the legislative branch; we gave them away.

Until we suffer the consequences of our profoundly foolish act in passing the line-item veto bill to begin with, it will be a continuing invitation for just the kind of abuse of executive power that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and others have pointed to.

We did this to ourselves. The only way we are going to come to our senses about our mistake is to have to suffer the consequences of that mistake.

We should vote no on this bill to force ourselves to live with what we did until we realize that we have it in our power to restore our constitutional rights. We gave them away. We cannot blame the President for taking advantage of that mistake.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1445

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first let me strongly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and everyone else for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, this is both a pro-defense and a pro-line item veto vote here today. The previous speaker is a good friend, a former Marine, but he is also the most outspoken opponent of the line-item veto, and I think he protests too much.

As a chief proponent of the line-item veto in this House, I am proud to say as chairman of one of the committees charged with the oversight of the line-item veto bill, I assure Members that such an action would be fully consistent with the intent of the line-item veto.

The line-item veto was written to give any President, regardless of party, the authority to highlight, in his opinion, questionable spending. Likewise, the law protects Congress' ability to defend its spending decisions and priorities by providing for this expedited procedure we have before us today.

Moving a bill which utilizes these procedures is in no way undermining the intent nor taints our strong support of the line-item veto.

Let me just tell Members something: If this does not pass today, we lower the level of spending by almost \$300 million, almost half a billion dollars. That lowers all the defense spending. We fight hard to maintain that level of spending.

I want everybody to come over here, those who supported the line-item veto, like I did, and I want you to vote to override the President. That is our prerogative as Members of this House.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2631, and I would urge everyone who supports our military to likewise support this legislation.

When this legislation originally passed, over 400 people in this body voted in favor of it, and I ask all 400 of them to vote the same way today. The reference is made that these projects are somehow wasteful and are pork-barrel kind of projects simply because they were not included in the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, each year I visit each of the military bases in my district and talk personally with the commanding officers and ask them what their priorities are and why their No. 1 priority is in fact their No. 1 priority.

In the case of my project that is in this bill, it is because it is a matter of safety, safety for our military people. This item is fully justified by all of the criteria that are established for military construction projects. It has met all these requirements, and I would say that the President made a grave mistake in striking this provision.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER.

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill of disapproval.

In 1995, the future years Defense plan showed that a chemical and biological testing facility was planned to be built at the Crane Naval Surface Warfare Center in fiscal year 1998—which is the Navy's designated agent for servicing and upgrading the chemical and biological weapon detection equipment deployed with the fleet.

Since Crane is in the district I represent, I spoke to the Navy about this construction.

I learned that the workload in this area was increasing dramatically and that the current facility would be hard put to handle the increase.

In 1996, this program slipped to fiscal year 1999.

This spring, I noticed that this project had slipped in the future years Defense plan to fiscal year 2000.

I found this disturbing in light of the hearings our committee was having.

For instance, on March 19, 1997, the Commander in Chief for the U.S. Central Command, General Peay, testified before the National Security Committee that, quote "The situation has worsened during the past twelve months, with Iraq, Iran and others in the Middle East aggressively . . . advancing their

chemical and biological research and development plans."

The Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan identified the capability for stand-off detection of chemical weapons as, quote "our single and most pressing need . . . critical to protecting our fielded forces."

The Chemical and Biological Testing facility was planned, necessary, and executionable.

The Congress was right to advance this project for our sailors.

The President made an error in vetoing it.

We should do the right thing again.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2631, which restores funding for the 38 military construction projects canceled by the President last month.

By any definition, the projects canceled by the administration are not pork and they are not wasteful. The Committee on National Security recently conducted a hearing on the administration's proposed cancellations, and the record is clear.

First, each of the proposed cancellations meets a validated military requirement. Second, each of the 38 projects is executable in this fiscal year. Third, nearly all these projects, 85 percent, are in the administration's own defense program. Fourth, the \$287 million associated with these projects is well within the limits established by the budget agreement.

In addition, the administration readily admits that mistakes were made in the President's extensive exercise of the line-item veto on the military construction appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the line-item veto. However, the veto power was given as a tool to be used to prevent unnecessary spending. Even the President does not contend that these projects were unnecessary.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like the skunk at the garden party. I rise to support the line-item veto.

This body in 1996 talked long and hard about how we were going to share the sacrifice across the country to make the tough decisions to balance the budget. Indeed, there is light at the end of the tunnel now, and that is very encouraging. But the fact of the matter is, we cannot expect to reach the end of that tunnel, nor can we expect to maintain our resolve to balance the budget, unless the sacrifice is truly shared.

We have not yet developed in this House or in Congress clear rules that avoid situations where one part of the country feels that another part of the

country is walking away with special projects or special opportunities. There have been attempts to do this, but, continuously, whether it be by report language or earmarks in appropriations bills or other bills, the principle is violated.

I have worked with Senator McCain and others to try to raise the standards in this respect. I know there are many others in this body that share that feeling. Otherwise, the line-item veto would not have passed by such an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is incumbent upon us to work with the White House to try to establish clear standards for, first, the use of the line-item veto, and, second, for our appropriations process, so that in the months ahead we do not see the line-item veto being exercised.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed almost to yield only 30 seconds to my next four speakers, the first of which is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this disapproval bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California, Chairman PACKARD, for his very hard work, but most especially for his using the line-item process properly.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] got up and said we are here to condone the President's mistakes. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are here to correct the President's mistake with this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. As one of the House's five majority conferees who secured final passage of the line-item veto, I am pleased to see the process we devised working. When the President first made use of his new line-item veto authority, naysayers and critics rushed to judgment and declared a falling sky. Those of us who support the line-item veto have repeatedly attempted to remind our colleagues that we did not go forward blindly in approving the line-item veto—that we carefully and painstakingly considered mechanisms to ensure that Congress would remain an integral part of the process. Today's consideration of a disapproval resolution on the President's cancellations from the fiscal year 1998 military construction spending bill underscores that fact. In this specific case, as all of us now know, the President has admitted making mistakes in applying the line-item veto to the military construction bill. By passing this disapproval resolution, we are giving the President a chance to correct those mistakes. We all know that there are lower priority and wasteful projects in spending bills that come out of the Congress. That's why we passed the line-item veto. But in this case, most of what the President chose to cancel through the line-item veto were projects that he himself has asked for. I am very concerned that we not continue to make funding for our troops

the easy target for spending cuts. National defense funding has already taken a disproportionate share of major hits under this President. For more than one reason the MilCon cancellations were a mistake; here's our chance to right that wrong.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

(Mr. SISISKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. I even had the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado, to go down to look at this project.

Let me just quickly tell you what was vetoed: A project that costs \$19.9 million in a figure for 1961; it would pay for itself, Navy figures, 2 years, 1 month, and deliver back to the taxpayers \$169 million in savings in 25 years. The computer printout, everything was there. It was vetoed. It should not have been vetoed. There were never questions asked by the Department of Defense. I would ask that we pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in responding to the President's decision to veto certain projects added to the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill—like Paul Harvey, I cannot pass up an opportunity to tell you "the rest of the story."

The waterfront improvements project at Norfolk Naval Shipyard is not a pork barrel project.

It's not part of some fly-by-night scheme to add wasteful, unnecessary spending to the benefit of only me or my district.

It was done in full light of day by authorizers and appropriators, first in the House and then in conference agreement with the Senate.

This project has been in the works since 1995. It is needed to make Norfolk Naval Shipyard more effective, efficient, and competitive.

The Project replaces and refurbishes antiquated wharf and berthing areas.

It demolishes two old buildings, along with shipways 1 and 2.

This area would then be used to install modern ship support systems, electric distribution systems, transformers, communications upgrades, steam and water distribution systems, sanitary sewer facilities, compressed air distribution systems, salt water fire protection facilities, railroads, and crane rails.

In short, these are the utilities and equipment necessary to run a modern industrial facility.

And that is a quality of life issue for civilian workers. And you know what? Sailors work there too.

So much for when the White House said "the project would not improve quality of life for military service members and their families."

The White House also said that, "architectural and engineering design of this project has not started."

Again, not true. Anyone who bothered to check would have known the project had

reached 35 percent design back in April of 1996.

Since there are no new buildings, the design issues are not all that complicated.

In fact, the design issues focused primarily on plans for demolition and asbestos removal.

The last time I checked, that was a very serious quality of life issue for sailors and civilian employees.

But I don't think anybody from OMB ever bothered to check.

Frankly, I think OMB wanted to shoehorn all 38 projects into their arbitrary criteria, come hell or high water, my mind's made up, don't confuse me with the facts.

I would like to know who misled the President about this, though.

Still, I have to confess, on one thing they were right: This project was not in the fiscal year 1998 budget.

It is in the Navy's 5-year plan for 2001. But if the project will be funded in a few years anyway, what's the big deal?

The big deal is money.

The longer we delay the project, the longer this part of the yard will be unable to play an effective part in the yard's ship repair mission.

The longer we delay, the longer the yard must wait to consolidate functions in the highly classified controlled industrial area.

The longer the yard maintains obsolete facilities, the greater their O&M and overhead costs.

The Navy's economic analysis shows return on investment for this project takes place in 2 years.

Let me say it again: This project pays for itself in 2 years.

Once you do this project, it saves approximately \$10 million per year in the first 2 years.

Once you sort through all the numbers, over the standard 25-year cycle, this project saves over \$169 million. I repeat: \$169 million.

My question to the White House is: Why delay it 4 years?

I have never heard of anything more penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The sooner we do it, the sooner we can put the money we save to a far better use; the sooner we can give sailors and civilian employees a safer, more productive working environment.

And the sooner we can refocus attention on the partnership that Congress and the President should have when it comes to protecting our national security.

I ask the House to override this veto.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I think nothing is more important today than working to support the morale of our men and women in uniform. The President vetoed a renovation project at Malmstrom Air Force Base for a dining hall; Mr. Speaker, a dining hall that, without repairs, will not meet the local civilian health standards.

The President's veto said that the health and safety of these men and women does not matter. Today we can say that it does matter and that we care, and we can do that by supporting this resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, support the line-item veto, but I think what is instructive about all this is, when the White House uses it inappropriately, as it has in this case by its own admission, that it is up to us to appropriately use our powers to correct the deficiencies in their process. That is what we are doing here today. It will restore an important project, one that is very valid and legitimate at Camp Rapid in South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BUYER.]

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for bringing up this bill. These are great bipartisan projects.

In particular, I want to thank the chairman. The gentleman was just down in Mayport Naval Air Station in Florida with me, and we actually went and saw one of the items that the President line item vetoed.

I wanted to share with Members, we have two Aegis cruisers down there. They had to shut them off, shut off the electronics, and they took tugboats and shoved these multimillion-dollar ships into the mud itself.

These are the types of projects the President line item vetoed, but he said if it is for social spending in the military, that is OK.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, many years ago, before the disaster struck a couple of years ago, I visited from California to Montana and States all over this Nation. I have been into residences where these people are living on the bases, our men and women. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I went to Fort Bragg, NC, and saw the conditions that the people were living in there.

We have young men and women that are called upon to operate the most sophisticated weapons on the face of the Earth, and some of them are living in World War II facilities.

Now, it is not every time that you put something in military construction that relates directly to quality of life, but if you have got a training center that was vetoed in this bill that is critical to training our troops that is in dangerous condition, just the facility, then that is something that adds to retention and quality of life for our men and women in the service.

This is not the place to debate the line item veto, but I stood in the well here and predicted that this sort of thing was going to happen, and it is going to get worse. It makes no difference whether it is a Republican President or Democrat President; when you start having the line item veto show up in political areas and being used as a political weapon, this is a disaster for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member to send a message early on, to send a message and vote unanimously in support of this bill.

I want to congratulate and thank all the Members and the staff people. I would strongly urge everyone to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank all of those who have participated, not only in this debate, but in helping to make this a successful bill and successful effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we gave the President the line-item veto to help him help us trim the budget and cut down the cost of Government and eliminate wasteful and unnecessary programs. That was a good idea.

We did not expect that he would come back on one of the first bills in the appropriations cycle and use sloppy and inadequate staff work and cut meaningful, worthwhile projects. But that is exactly what he did.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for their foresight and vision in making sure that we enforce this system.

The President has a significant new power. He should use it wisely. He used it unwisely in this instance. Witness the Utah project, which was a good system to provide for the people that were training for the Olympics, or all the other projects that have been mentioned here today. These were worthwhile projects to improve the quality of life for military personnel. They should not have been struck. They should not have been used as an example by the President to flex his power, which was given to him for worthy purposes and a good cause.

It is up to us to remedy that mistake. He made the mistake. He tried to cover up on it by saying, oh, he would cure the mistake with a future budget request. That is not good enough.

□ 1500

The way he pays for the mistake is for us to disapprove these cancellations. We should do it today.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, today the house votes to sustain or override the President's line-item veto of vital projects contained in the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill. I want to share with my colleagues, and submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial appearing in one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Clayton News/Daily. I agree with Publisher Neely

Young and Editor Tom Kerlin that giving the line-item veto to the President of the United States is an excellent method to control wasteful Federal spending and programs and was proper.

I supported and voted for the bill that gave this power to the President. However, Mr. Speaker, I disagree when the President uses that power to deny funding to military construction projects that Congress has deemed vital to our national defense. I refer specifically to the President's decision to cut funds for a combat rescue operations facility located at Moody Air Force Base near Valdosta, GA.

The President said he vetoed funds for this facility because the personnel comprising these rescue units had not yet relocated to Moody Air Force Base. More thorough research would have shown the President these units have been in operation at Moody AFB since April of this year and are using rented trailers while awaiting construction funds. Our military personnel deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I still support the President having line-item veto authority to eliminate wasteful Federal spending. Providing permanent operations facilities for our military personnel is not a waste of Federal tax dollars, and I will vote to override the President's veto of this bill.

[From the Clayton News-Daily]

OPINION—BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

Since the idea was first seriously broached, we have said the line-item veto was the perfect tool for controlling pork barrel spending by the federal government. We still believe that is true.

However, a move Monday by President Clinton in striking out the appropriations for a combat rescue operations facility for Moody Air Force Base in south Georgia is a bad example of the new power in the hands of the Executive Branch of our federal government.

In using his veto, Clinton said he did so because the money for military construction is not needed since the two units slated to use the facility have not yet been moved from Patrick Air Force Base in Florida.

That comes as news to the Sen. Max Cleland, who asked that the spending bill be attached to the 1998 military construction spending bill. It's also a revelation to the base commander at Moody AFB. Cleland said the two units, the 41st and 71st rescue squadrons, have been at Moody since April. Officials at the installation near Valdosta confirmed that the move has been completed and the units are operating out of rented trailers.

The Pentagon announced plans in early 1996 to relocate the two rescue squadrons to Moody. The relocation has brought 680 military personnel to the base, although many of them are deployed with U.S. troops to various trouble spots like Bosnia.

"I am very disappointed by this veto," said Cleland. "There is no rhyme or reason to it. Of all the projects that were included in the bill, this one made the most sense. It was my top priority for Georgia."

Sen. Paul Coverdell, R-Ga., called the veto "an arbitrary, uninformed exercise of executive power" and vowed to work with other Georgia lawmakers to overturn it.

Rep. Sanford Bishop of Albany, whose district includes the base, said the facility is essential "to maintain high readiness for this important rescue unit."

Cleland says he "support(s) the line-item veto as a way to cut out pork and reduce the deficit," but added "this facility is not pork. It is a critical project. If facilities to accom-

modate a pararescue facility are not essential, I do not know what is."

We agree with Cleland and Coverdell on this one. We wonder if Clinton got bad information, misinterpreted the information, or if he just didn't do his homework.

Either way he has managed to attain bipartisan opposition over the issue—something he can ill afford to do.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2631, a bill disapproving the cancellations of 38 military construction projects. I want to thank both distinguished Chairman HEFLEY and Chairman PACKARD for their hard work in producing two solid bills.

I voted for the line-item veto and have no problem seeing the President use it. However, it must be used properly and wisely. These 38 vetoed projects were not the famous \$600 hammers and \$1200 toilet seats the Pentagon has purchased in the past. That is what the line item was developed for.

At Arnold Engineering Development Center [AEDC] in Tullahoma, TN, a new \$9.9 million air dryer facility for the propulsion wind tunnel was eliminated by President Clinton. The wind tunnel performs advanced testing which requires dry air for simulating flight conditions. It is a critical element for ensuring accurate test results.

This cancellation will affect advanced aerospace testing for the F-22, the joint strike fighter, missiles and other state of the art flight designs. All of which require dry air for high-altitude testing. The air dryer is vital to the performance and safety for both aircraft and personnel. Any further delays in advanced wind tunnel testing for aerospace programs will certainly demand cost overruns.

The existing facility was built in 1959 and does not have the capacity to provide continuous dry air flow needed to complete aerospace testing. A major failure of the current dryer would result in an estimated 26-weeks of lost test time. Furthermore, for every 20 hours of wind tunnel testing, it must shut down for 12 hours. Delaying construction will lead to additional costs of \$1.2 million per year.

This project meets the President's so called criteria, although it is a bit vague. The new air dryer is in the President's 5-year defense budget. Architectural and engineering designs for the project were underway and construction could begin in fiscal year 1998.

The White House, the Pentagon, the Air Force, and the Office of Management Budget [OMB], have all stated on the record that crucial project data was in fact outdated and led to misinformation. The end result was that legitimate and essential military construction projects were terminated based on bad data and an inconsistent, if not, arbitrary selection process without a clear set of criteria.

AEDC relies some of the most sophisticated technologies in the world to test aerospace systems before flight. They are using antiquated 1950's technology and infrastructure to test 1990's advanced aerospace programs worth billions of dollars.

The bottom line is that this project is critical. It is critical in maintaining a portion of our military superiority. It is important, relevant and a validated military requirement for a sound infrastructure. I think that after you look at this project, you too will agree it is not what the line item veto was designed for.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 2631, I want to thank Chairman PACKARD and Mr. SKEEN for their work in getting this measure to the floor today. Many of the projects being restored will improve the quality of life for our servicemen and women. I am particularly grateful that it will restore funding for a project of vital importance to my constituents in Salk Lake City, the Olympic Village. The \$12 million in construction funds for Fort Douglas will allow the military reserves to relocate in time for the University of Utah to acquire the land and complete construction of the Olympic Village for the 2002 Winter Games. Salt Lake City may be the host city for the 2002 Winter Olympic's—but these are America games.

This bill is the first step toward overturning the President's veto and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, today this Congress has a unique opportunity. A chance to right a wrong, a chance to stand up for America, a chance to show you care to the men and women of our military and the communities which support them. A few short weeks ago, President Clinton vetoed essential military construction projects without properly consulting our military, without consideration of the impact of these vetoes on the lives and well being of our military, without consideration of the long term security interests of America. This has been going on for far too long and today we finally have an opportunity to say enough to this White House.

I have the honor and privilege of representing some of the most patriotic communities in America. Two of these communities, Del Rio and El Paso, are home of two of our finest military installations, Laughlin Air Force Base and Fort Bliss. I can say without exaggeration that Laughlin is the finest little base in the Air Force and Fort Bliss' vastness is an unmatched national security asset. Therefore I, along with each and every citizen of Del Rio and El Paso, was shocked when the President chose to veto essential projects in these communities. Today's legislation provides us with an opportunity to stand up for our military, to improve our military quality of life, to show we value our military efforts.

I want to personally tell the people of Del Rio and El Paso that this Congress will not abandon you, this Congress will not abandon our military. Today we will demonstrate our complete and total rejection of the President's dangerous and irresponsible cuts. Today we can stand united with the people of Del Rio and El Paso and reject the President's assault on our military and these communities. My colleagues, I urge you, join me in standing united with the good people of Del Rio and El Paso and turn back this President's attack on our military. Vote "yes" on H.R. 2631.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the President's use of the line-item veto on the military construction appropriations bill.

Now, I support the concept of the line-item veto. It's a tool Presidents should have as long as deficit spending continues. But my support doesn't mean that I must agree with its use in every instance.

On these specific vetoes, the administration has admitted that projects were mistakenly vetoed. One such mistake was in my district.

The President vetoed a qualified training range at Fort Knox. This range is an insightful,

cost-effective efficient answer for arms training. It saves valuable training dollars and hours by creating one range that will meet training standards for 11 different weapons.

This project saves money, time, and reduces risk to soldiers. In fact, it fulfills Secretary West's stated goal of "pursuing innovative ideas to increase efficiency."

However, the President did not consider this goal when using his line-item veto authority. Instead, he considered factors that don't hold up under close scrutiny.

According to the President, he vetoed those projects that were not included in his original budget request, those for which design work had not been completed, and those that, in his view, would provide no substantial contribution to improving the lives of soldiers.

His first reason is far-fetched because this range was included in his 5 year military construction plan. Getting beyond this fact, his original argument still doesn't stand up. Congress added many more projects than the 38 vetoed. Why didn't the President veto all of them? After all, none of them were included in his budget request.

His second reason is simply wrong. Construction is scheduled to begin next summer if the funding is approved. Furthermore, design work on this project is well underway.

Finally, to suggest this would have made no substantial contribution to the lives of soldiers is misinformed. The Army agrees that this project is needed to correct shortfalls in mandatory training. To even suggest this would not have contributed to the lives of soldiers reveals the sharp philosophical differences between the President and myself on this issue—the importance of investing in those Americans upon which our national defense rests.

Let's not put the lives of our soldiers at risk because of mistakes. The process allows us to override this veto. I urge my colleagues to do just that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EWING]. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2631.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Without objection, the minimum time for electronic voting on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, postponed earlier today, will be 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 64, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 617]

YEAS—352

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt

Allen
Archer
Armey

Bachus
Baesler
Baker

Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella

Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryun
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shinkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)

Smith, Adam	Tauscher	Watkins	[Roll No. 618]	Whitfield	Wise	Young (AK)
Smith, Linda	Tauzin	Watt (NC)		Wicker	Wolf	Young (FL)
Snowbarger	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)	YEAS—291		NAYS—125	
Snyder	Thomas	Weldon (FL)	Gekas	Northrup		
Solomon	Thompson	Weldon (PA)	Gephardt	Norwood	Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)
Souder	Thornberry	Weller	Gibbons	Nussle	Ackerman	Hilliard
Spence	Thune	Weygand	Gilchrest	Olver	Andrews	Jackson (IL)
Spratt	Thurman	White	Gilman	Ortiz	Barrett (WI)	Jackson-Lee
Stabenow	Tiahrt	Whitfield	Gingrich	Oxley	Becerra	(TX)
Stearns	Wicker	Wick	Goode	Packard	Berman	Jefferson
Stenholm	Torres	Wise	Goodlatte	Pappas	Blagojevich	Johnson, E. B.
Stokes	Trafigant	Wolf	Goodling	Parker	Boehlert	Kaptur
Stump	Turner	Woolsey	Gordon	Pastor	Bonior	Kennedy (RI)
Sununu	Velazquez	Wynn	Goss	Paxon	Borski	Kildee
Talent	Visclosky	Young (AK)	Graham	Pease	Brown (FL)	Kilpatrick
Tanner	Wamp	Young (FL)	Granger	Peterson (MN)	Brown (OH)	Klecicka
			Green	Peterson (PA)	Campbell	Kucinich
			Greenwood	Petri	Carson	Lantos
			Gutknecht	Pickering	Clay	Levin
			Hall (OH)	Pickett	Conyers	Lewis (GA)
			Hall (TX)	Pitts	Cummings	Lipinski
			Hamilton	Pombo	Danner	Lofgren
			Hansen	Pomeroy	Davis (FL)	Lowey
			Hastert	Porter	Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)
			Biiley	Portman	DeFazio	Manton
			Hayworth	Poshard	DeGette	Markey
			Hefley	Price (NC)	Delahunt	Martinez
			Hefner	Pryce (OH)	DeLauro	Matsui
			Herger	Radanovich	Dellums	McCarthy (MO)
			Hill	Rahall	Deutsch	McGovern
			Hilleary	Ramstad	Dicks	McHale
			Hinchev	Redmond	Dingell	McKinney
			Hinojosa	Regula	Dixon	McNulty
			Hobson	Reyes	Doggett	Meehan
			Hoekstra	Riggs	Engel	Meek
			Holden	Rodriguez	Eshoo	Menendez
			Hooley	Rogan	Fattah	Millender
			Horn	Rogers	Fazio	McDonald
			Hostettler	Rohrabacher	Filner	Miller (CA)
			Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen	Flake	Mink
			Hoyer	Roukema	Forbes	Moakley
			Hulshof	Ryun	Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)
			Canady	Salmon	Franks (NJ)	Murtha
			Cannon	Sandlin	Furse	Nadler
			Cardin	Saxton	Gejdenson	Neal
			Castle	Schaefer, Dan	Gutierrez	Oberstar
			Chabot	Schaffer, Bob	Harman	Obey
			Chambliss	Sensenbrenner		
			Chenoweth	Sessions		
			Christensen	Shadeegg		
			Clayton	Shaw		
			Clement	Shimkus		
			Clyburn	Shuster		
			Coble	Sisisky		
			Coburn	Skeen		
			Collins	Skelton		
			Combest	Smith (MI)		
			Condit	Smith (NJ)		
			Cook	Smith (OR)		
			Cooksey	Smith (TX)		
			Costello	Smith, Adam		
			Cox	Smith, Linda		
			Coyne	Snowbarger		
			Cramer	Solomon		
			Crane	Souder		
			Crapo	Spence		
			Cunningham	Spratt		
			Davis (VA)	Stabenow		
			Deal	Stearns		
			DeLay	Stenholm		
			Diaz-Balart	Stump		
			Dickey	Stupak		
			Dooley	Sununu		
			Doolittle	Talent		
			Doyle	Tanner		
			Dreier	Tauscher		
			Duncan	Tauzin		
			Dunn	Taylor (MS)		
			Edwards	Thomas		
			Ehlers	Thompson		
			Ehrlich	Thornberry		
			Emerson	Thune		
			English	Thurman		
			Ensign	Tiahrt		
			Etheridge	Trafigant		
			Evans	Turner		
			Everett	Upton		
			Ewing	Wamp		
			Farr	Watkins		
			Fawell	Watts (OK)		
			Foley	Weldon (FL)		
			Ford	Weldon (PA)		
			Fossella	Weller		
			Fowler	White		
			Fox			
			Frelinghuysen			
			Frost			
			Gallegly			
			Ganske			

NAYS—64

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Carson
Chabot
Conyers
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Ensign
Ewing
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske

Greenwood
Harman
Johnson (WI)
Kind (WI)
LaHood
Leach
Luther
Markley
McCarthy (MO)
McKinney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Minge
Nussle
Owens
Petri
Poshard
Ramstad
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema

Roybal-Allard
Royer
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Wexler

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Quinn
Riley
Schiff
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Yates

□ 1525

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Messrs. ROTHMAN, EWING, DICKEY, MARKEY, STUPAK, WAXMAN, and RUSH Rush changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BRADY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 125, not voting 18, as follows:

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Quinn
Riley
Schiff
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Yates

□ 1540

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GREEN and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1150), to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], is

this on the bill we just passed? I voted for the bill that we just passed. But there is a lot of concern, as my colleague knows. And I presume we are going to conference on this bill.

Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. How did he vote?

Mr. HOYER. I voted "aye" on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Good.

Mr. HOYER. I know the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] thinks that is good. The chairman or the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations does not think it is good. The reason he does not think it is good is because we on the Committee on Appropriations are concerned that there is already a done deal and the Committee on Appropriations is going to be in a bad strait as a result.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] that there has been no negotiation with the Senate, the other body. There has been not one word from me or anyone in the House or on the Committee on Agriculture or by the staff. We have been awaiting the passage of a clean bill, which all should support. We have heard the questions raised from some as we debated the bill.

I understand the issues. Both parties will be, of course, represented in the conference. And I understand the concern of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Under those circumstances, I will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], to ask a couple of questions with regard to the conference that the committee would have on this bill.

The question I have is, if we are going to conference, my understanding is there is a large difference between the Senate version and the House version in one critical respect, that the Senate version extracts \$1.2 billion in savings from food stamp programs through administrative accounts, and my understanding from the Senate bill is that none of that money was put back into food stamps.

On this side, some of my colleagues are concerned that none of the money, that \$1.2 billion, will be used to restore food stamp programs, \$27½ billion that was cut last year.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is correct, the House bill is an authorization of \$2.8 billion to various States regarding agricultural research, which has come unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture.

□ 1545

The Senate bill has an additional \$1.25 billion, and frankly I am not exactly sure how they want to distribute it. But I have heard, as I mentioned, from many people, including the gentleman from California, regarding his concern. He will have representatives on the conference committee. So will we. To try to suggest to him what will be finally decided by the conference committee, I cannot. All I can say to the gentleman is if this bill does not pass and the gentleman objects, then he has no possibility of gaining anything that he wants out of the conference committee.

Mr. BECERRA. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is we are operating under martial law which allows any bill to come to the floor under a unanimous-consent request. Most of us who opposed the bill right now on suspension are not opposed to this House bill. What we are opposed to is the preconferecing that we are aware of that has already been undertaken on this bill with the Senate which did not include funding for food stamps, at least not to any measurable degree. The concern on the part of a number of us is that the \$1.2 billion that will be taken out of food stamps will not be used to any measurable degree to go back to food stamps. Otherwise, I think he would find that virtually with a unanimous vote, this bill would go through if there were some assurance that there would be money invested in food stamps to restore some of the \$27.5 billion that we cut from food stamps last year.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sorry the gentleman missed the debate. He could have responded in exactly that way instead of at this late date. But let me say to the gentleman as I have responded to the gentleman from Maryland, there has been no preconferecing of this bill. Beyond that, it is very difficult for me to predict what will occur in a conference committee. I can tell the gentleman that his side will be represented and I have heard his concerns. I reiterate. If the gentleman does not allow this bill to pass, he will have no chance to increase funding for his concerns at all. If he allows this bill to go forward, he will have a chance in the conference, and if he does not like it, he merely defeats the conference report.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I voted for the bill but I also support the cause for I know why

125 did not. I voted for the bill because nothing in the bill itself says it is going to take any of that money to use it in any way. But because people have the lack of trust in the conferencing process, they are now expressing their will now. Not because of the bill. I guess if the chairman and the ranking member could assure that in that process that those moneys that have been allocated to food, \$1.2 billion, would not be deviated or given to other things, I think that kind of advocacy or opportunity for advocacy would reassure people here that what is now clean would later become convoluted and taking away much needed resources from people who need it who are hungry.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, just as I have not preconference with the Senate nor do I want to preconference with this body, the point is that I have listened, as has the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture who no doubt will be on the conference committee. We understand the gentleman's concerns and we will take them to the conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to arbitrarily cut this off, but at the same time I do not want the House to engage in needless conversation when this proposition is going to be objected to, and I am going to object. The fact is that we have been told by a lobbyist on good authority that he has already been told what number he is going to get under the conference agreement. It seems to me that there may not have been a preconference, but it appears to me that there is a pretty good idea of what is likely to happen once that conference takes place.

I do not want this House to be in a position where Members, regardless of which side of the issue they are on, find the committee coming back in the dead of night with a done deal and having this bill pass with virtually nobody on the floor.

To try to help save Members from that, I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Objection is heard.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

(Mr. SMITH of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think the point is here, and I can speak for the gentleman from Texas, neither he nor I have discussed, or pre-conferenced this bill with the Senate or with any lobbyist.

The gentleman has on his shoulders now the rejection of \$2.8 billion of research to agriculture throughout the

United States, which I think is a horrible thing to do. I am sorry that he objected. He will have to answer for his objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, that is fine. The gentleman can live with the objection. I was trying to do him a favor. Forget it. No, I do not want to speak now. If the gentleman does not want to work it out, then I object.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For 1 minute?

Ms. KAPTUR. I hope for at least 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to address the House for 1 minute?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to ask the gentleman what subject she would like to discuss.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the chairman a question or two.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I suppose that that is in order, Mr. Speaker, but since the issue is no longer before us, there was an objection made, then we cannot go forward, so this issue is dead. So I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST TO SPEAK OUT OF ORDER

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1½ minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has just been heard to that request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Who objected to that?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I did.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to the membership that something is going on here. Something is going on here that should trouble the membership.

REQUEST TO SPEAK OUT OF ORDER

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Ms. KAPTUR. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2264) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes."

READING EXCELLENCE ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2614) to improve the reading and literacy skills of children and families by improving in-service instructional practices for teachers who teach reading, to stimulate the development of more high-quality family literacy programs, to support extended learning-time opportunities for children, to ensure that children can read well and independently not later than third grade, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reading Excellence Act".

TITLE I—READING GRANTS

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO ESEA FOR READING GRANTS.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE XV—READING GRANTS

"SEC. 15101. PURPOSE.

"The purposes of this title are as follows:
"(1) To teach every child to read in their early childhood years—

"(A) as soon as they are ready to read; or
"(B) as soon as possible once they enter school, but not later than 3d grade.

"(2) To improve the reading skills of students, and the in-service instructional practices for teachers who teach reading, through the use of findings from reliable, replicable research on reading, including phonics.

"(3) To expand the number of high-quality family literacy programs.

"(4) To reduce the number of children who are inappropriately referred to special education due to reading difficulties.

"SEC. 15102. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title:

"(1) ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROVIDER.—The term 'eligible professional development provider' means a provider of professional development in reading instruction to teachers that is based on reliable, replicable research on reading.

"(2) ELIGIBLE RESEARCH INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible research institution' means an institution of higher education at which reliable, replicable research on reading has been conducted.

"(3) FAMILY LITERACY SERVICES.—The term 'family literacy services' means services provided to participants on a voluntary basis that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family (such as eliminating or reducing welfare dependency) and that integrate all of the following activities:

"(A) Interactive literacy activities between parents and their children.

"(B) Equipping parents to partner with their children in learning.

"(C) Parent literacy training, including training that contributes to economic self-sufficiency.

"(D) Appropriate instruction for children of parents receiving parent literacy services.

"(4) READING.—The term 'reading' means the process of comprehending the meaning of written text by depending on—

"(A) the ability to use phonics skills, that is, knowledge of letters and sounds, to decode printed words quickly and effortlessly, both silently and aloud;

"(B) the ability to use previously learned strategies for reading comprehension; and

"(C) the ability to think critically about the meaning, message, and aesthetic value of the text.

"(5) READING READINESS.—The term 'reading readiness' means activities that—

"(A) provide experience and opportunity for language development;

"(B) create appreciation of the written word;

"(C) develop an awareness of printed language, the alphabet, and phonemic awareness; and

"(D) develop an understanding that spoken and written language is made up of phonemes, syllables, and words.

"(6) RELIABLE, REPLICABLE RESEARCH.—The term 'reliable, replicable research' means objective, valid, scientific studies that—

"(A) include rigorously defined samples of subjects that are sufficiently large and representative to support the general conclusions drawn;

"(B) rely on measurements that meet established standards of reliability and validity;

"(C) test competing theories, where multiple theories exist;

"(D) are subjected to peer review before their results are published; and

"(E) discover effective strategies for improving reading skills.

"SEC. 15103. GRANTS TO READING AND LITERACY PARTNERSHIPS.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may make grants on a competitive basis to reading and literacy partnerships for the purpose of permitting such partnerships to make subgrants under sections 15104 and 15105.

"(b) READING AND LITERACY PARTNERSHIPS.—

"(1) COMPOSITION.—

"(A) REQUIRED PARTICIPANTS.—In order to receive a grant under this section, a State shall establish a reading and literacy partnership consisting of at least the following participants:

"(i) The Governor of the State.

"(ii) The chief State school officer.

"(iii) The chairman and the ranking member of each committee of the State legislature that is responsible for education policy.

"(iv) A representative, selected jointly by the Governor and the chief State school officer, of at least 1 local educational agency that has at least 1 school that is identified for school improvement under section 1116(c) in the geographic area served by the agency.

"(v) A representative, selected jointly by the Governor and the chief State school officer, of a community-based organization working with children to improve their reading skills, particularly a community-based organization using volunteers.

"(B) OPTIONAL PARTICIPANTS.—A reading and literacy partnership may include additional participants, who shall be selected jointly by the Governor and the chief State school officer, which may include—

“(i) State directors of appropriate Federal or State programs with a strong reading component;

“(ii) a parent of a public or private school student or a parent who educates their child or children in their home;

“(iii) a teacher who teaches reading; or

“(iv) a representative of (I) an institution of higher education operating a program of teacher preparation in the State; (II) a local educational agency; (III) an eligible research institution; (IV) a private nonprofit or for-profit eligible professional development provider providing instruction based on reliable, replicable research on reading; (V) a family literacy service provider; (VI) an adult education provider; (VII) a volunteer organization that is involved in reading programs; or (VIII) a school or a public library that offers reading or literacy programs for children or families.

“(2) AGREEMENT.—The contractual agreement that establishes a reading and literacy partnership—

“(A) shall specify—

“(i) the nature and extent of the association among the participants referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) the roles and duties of each such participant; and

“(B) shall remain in effect during the entire grant period proposed in the partnership's grant application under subsection (e).

“(3) FUNCTIONS.—Each reading and literacy partnership for a State shall prepare and submit an application under subsection (e) and, if the partnership receives a grant under this section—

“(A) shall solicit applications for, and award, subgrants under sections 15104 and 15105;

“(B) shall oversee the performance of the subgrants and submit performance reports in accordance with subsection (h);

“(C) if sufficient grant funds are available under this title—

“(i) work to enhance the capacity of agencies in the State to disseminate reliable, replicable research on reading to schools, classrooms, and providers of early education and child care;

“(ii) facilitate the provision of technical assistance to subgrantees under sections 15104 and 15105 by providing them information about technical assistance providers; and

“(iii) build on, and promote coordination among, literacy programs in the State, in order to increase their effectiveness and to avoid duplication of their efforts; and

“(D) shall ensure that each local educational agency to which the partnership makes a subgrant under section 15104 makes available, upon request and in an understandable and uniform format, to any parent of a student attending any school selected under section 15104(a)(2) in the geographic area served by the agency, information regarding the qualifications of the student's classroom teacher to provide instruction in reading.

“(4) FISCAL AGENT.—The State educational agency shall act as the fiscal agent for the reading and literacy partnership for the purposes of receipt of funds from the Secretary, disbursement of funds to subgrantees under sections 15104 and 15105, and accounting for such funds.

“(c) PRE-EXISTING PARTNERSHIP.—If, before the date of the enactment of the Reading Excellence Act, a State established a consortium, partnership, or any other similar body, that includes the Governor and the chief State school officer and has, as a central part of its mission, the promotion of literacy for children in their early childhood years through the 3d grade, but that does not satisfy the requirements of subsection (b)(1),

the State may elect to treat that consortium, partnership, or body as the reading and literacy partnership for the State notwithstanding such subsection, and it shall be considered a reading and literacy partnership for purposes of the other provisions of this title.

“(d) MULTI-STATE PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS.—A reading and literacy partnership that satisfies the requirements of subsection (b) may join with other such partnerships in other States to develop a single application that satisfies the requirements of subsection (e) and identifies which State educational agency, from among the States joining, shall act as the fiscal agent for the multi-State arrangement. For purposes of the other provisions of this title, any such multi-State arrangement shall be considered to be a reading and literacy partnership.

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—A reading and literacy partnership that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and including such information as the Secretary may require. The application—

“(1) shall describe how the partnership will ensure that 95 percent of the grant funds are used to make subgrants under sections 15104 and 15105;

“(2) shall be integrated, to the maximum extent possible, with State plans and programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and, to the extent appropriate, the Adult Education Act;

“(3) shall describe how the partnership will ensure that professional development funds available at the State and local levels are used effectively to improve instructional practices for reading and are based on reliable, replicable research on reading;

“(4) shall describe—

“(A) the contractual agreement that establishes the partnership, including at least the elements of the agreement referred to in subsection (b)(2);

“(B) how the partnership will assess, on a regular basis, the extent to which the activities undertaken by the partnership and the partnership's subgrantees under this title have been effective in achieving the purposes of this title;

“(C) what evaluation instruments the partnership will use to determine the success of local educational agencies to whom subgrants under sections 15104 and 15105 are made in achieving the purposes of this title;

“(D) how subgrants made by the partnership under such sections will meet the requirements of this title, including how the partnership will ensure that subgrantees will use practices based on reliable, replicable research on reading; and

“(E) how the partnership will, to the extent practicable, make grants to subgrantees in both rural and urban areas;

“(5) shall include an assurance that each local educational agency to whom the partnership makes a subgrant under section 15104—

“(A) will carry out family literacy programs based on the Even Start family literacy model authorized under part B of title I to enable parents to be their child's first and most important teacher, and will make payments for the receipt of technical assistance for the development of such programs;

“(B) will carry out programs to assist those kindergarten students who are not ready for the transition to 1st grade, particularly students experiencing difficulty with reading skills;

“(C) will use supervised individuals (including tutors), who have been appropriately trained using reliable, replicable research on reading, to provide additional support, before school, after school, on weekends, during non-instructional periods of the school day,

or during the summer, for students in grades 1 through 3 who are experiencing difficulty reading; and

“(D) will carry out professional development for the classroom teacher and other appropriate teaching staff on the teaching of reading based on reliable, replicable research on reading; and

“(6) shall describe how the partnership—

“(A) will ensure that a portion of the grant funds that the partnership receives in each fiscal year will be used to make subgrants under section 15105; and

“(B) will make local educational agencies described in section 15105(a)(1) aware of the availability of such subgrants.

“(f) PEER REVIEW PANEL.—

“(1) COMPOSITION OF PEER REVIEW PANEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Institute for Literacy, in consultation with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the Secretary, shall convene a panel to evaluate applications under this section. At a minimum the panel shall include representatives of the National Institute for Literacy, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the Secretary.

“(B) EXPERTS.—The panel shall include experts who are competent, by virtue of their training, expertise, or experience, to evaluate applications under this section, and experts who provide professional development to teachers of reading to children and adults, based on reliable, replicable research on reading.

“(C) LIMITATION.—Not more than 1/3 of the panel may be composed of individuals who are employees of the Federal Government.

“(2) PAYMENT OF FEES AND EXPENSES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall use funds reserved under section 15109(b)(2) to pay the expenses and fees of panel members who are not employees of the Federal Government.

“(3) DUTIES OF PANEL.—

“(A) MODEL APPLICATION FORMS.—The peer review panel shall develop a model application form for reading and literacy partnerships desiring to apply for a grant under this section. The peer review panel shall submit the model application form to the Secretary for final approval.

“(B) SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall receive grant applications from reading and literacy partnerships under this section and shall provide the applications to the peer review panel for evaluation. With respect to each application, the peer review panel shall initially recommend the application for funding or for disapproval.

“(II) PRIORITY.—In recommending applications to the Secretary, the panel shall give priority to applications from States that have modified, are modifying, or provide an assurance that not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under this section the State will modify, State teacher certification in the area of reading to reflect reliable, replicable research, except that nothing in this Act shall be construed to establish a national system of teacher certification.

“(III) RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—With respect to each application recommended for funding, the panel shall assign the application a rank, relative to other recommended applications, based on the priority described in subclause (II), the extent to which the application furthers the purposes of this part, and the overall quality of the application.

“(IV) RECOMMENDATION OF AMOUNT.—With respect to each application recommended for

funding, the panel shall make a recommendation to the Secretary with respect to the amount of the grant that should be made.

“(ii) SECRETARIAL SELECTION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (iii), the Secretary shall determine, based on the peer review panel's recommendations, which applications from reading and literacy partnerships shall receive funding and the amounts of such grants. In determining grant amounts, the Secretary shall take into account the total amount of funds available for all grants under this section and the types of activities proposed to be carried out by the partnership.

“(II) EFFECT OF RANKING BY PANEL.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall select applications according to the ranking of the applications by the peer review panel, except in cases where the Secretary determines, for good cause, that a variation from that order is appropriate.

“(iii) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNTS.—Each reading and literacy partnership selected to receive a grant under this section shall receive an amount for each fiscal year that is not less than \$100,000.

“(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A reading and literacy partnership that receives a grant under this section may use not more than 3 percent of the grant funds for administrative costs.

“(h) REPORTING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A reading and literacy partnership that receives a grant under this section shall submit performance reports to the Secretary pursuant to a schedule to be determined by the Secretary, but not more frequently than annually. Such reports shall include—

“(A) the results of use of the evaluation instruments referred to in subsection (e)(4)(C);

“(B) the process used to select subgrantees;

“(C) a description of the subgrantees receiving funds under this title; and

“(D) with respect to subgrants under section 15104, the model or models of reading instruction, based on reliable, replicable research on reading, selected by subgrantees.

“(2) PROVISION TO PEER REVIEW PANEL.—The Secretary shall provide the reports submitted under paragraph (I) to the peer review panel convened under subsection (f). The panel shall use such reports in recommending applications for funding under this section.

“SEC. 15104. LOCAL READING IMPROVEMENT SUBGRANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(I) SUBGRANTS.—A reading and literacy partnership that receives a grant under section 15103 shall make subgrants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies that have at least 1 school that is identified for school improvement under section 1116(c) in the geographic area served by the agency.

“(2) ROLE OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—A local educational agency that receives a subgrant under this section shall use the subgrant in a manner consistent with this section to advance reform of reading instruction in any school selected by the agency that—

“(A) is identified for school improvement under section 1116(c) at the time the agency receives the subgrant; and

“(B) has a contractual association with 1 or more community-based organizations that have established a record of effectiveness with respect to reading readiness, reading instruction for children in kindergarten through 3d grade, and early childhood literacy.

“(b) GRANT PERIOD.—A subgrant under this section shall be for a period of 3 years and may not be revoked or terminated on the ground that a school ceases, during the grant

period, to be identified for school improvement under section 1116(c).

“(c) APPLICATIONS.—A local educational agency that desires to receive a subgrant under this section shall submit an application to the reading and literacy partnership at such time, in such manner, and including such information as the partnership may require. The application—

“(1) shall describe how the local educational agency will work with schools selected by the agency under subsection (a)(2) to select 1 or more models of reading instruction, developed using reliable, replicable research on reading, as a model for implementing and improving reading instruction by all teachers and for all children in each of the schools selected by the agency under such subsection and, where appropriate, their parents;

“(2) shall select 1 or more models described in paragraph (1), for the purpose described in such paragraph, and shall describe each such selected model;

“(3) shall demonstrate that a person responsible for the development of each such model, or a person with experience or expertise about such model and its implementation, has agreed to work with the applicant in connection with such implementation and improvement efforts;

“(4) shall describe—

“(A) how the applicant will ensure that funds available under this title, and funds available for reading for grades kindergarten through grade 6 from other appropriate sources, are effectively coordinated and, where appropriate, integrated, with funds under this Act in order to improve existing activities in the areas of reading instruction, professional development, program improvement, parental involvement, technical assistance, and other activities that can help meet the purposes of this title; and

“(B) the amount of funds available for reading for grades kindergarten through grade 6 from appropriate sources other than this title, including title I of this Act (except that such description shall not be required to include funds made available under part B of title I of this Act unless the applicant has established a contractual association in accordance with subsection (d)(2) with an eligible entity under such part B), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and any other law providing Federal financial assistance for professional development for teachers of such grades who teach reading, which will be used to help achieve the purposes of this title;

“(5) shall describe the amount and nature of funds from any other public or private sources, including funds received under this Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, that will be combined with funds received under the subgrant;

“(6) shall include an assurance that the applicant—

“(A) will carry out family literacy programs based on the Even Start family literacy model authorized under part B of title I to enable parents to be their child's first and most important teacher, will make payments for the receipt of technical assistance for the development of such programs;

“(B) will carry out programs to assist those kindergarten students who are not ready for the transition to 1st grade, particularly students experiencing difficulty with reading skills;

“(C) will use supervised individuals (including tutors), who have been appropriately trained using reliable, replicable research on reading, to provide additional support, before school, after school, on weekends, during non-instructional periods of the school day, or during the summer, for students in grades

1 through 3 who are experiencing difficulty reading; and

“(D) will carry out professional development for the classroom teacher and other teaching staff on the teaching of reading based on reliable, replicable research on reading;

“(7) shall describe how the local educational agency provides instruction in reading to children who have not been determined to be a child with a disability (as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), pursuant to section 614(b)(5) of such Act, because of a lack of instruction in reading; and

“(8) shall indicate the amount of the subgrant funds (if any) that the applicant will use to carry out the duties described in section 15105(b)(2).

“(d) PRIORITY.—In approving applications under this section, a reading and literacy partnership shall give priority to applications submitted by applicants who demonstrate that they have established—

“(1) a contractual association with 1 or more Head Start programs under the Head Start Act under which—

“(A) the Head Start programs agree to select the same model or models of reading instruction, as a model for implementing and improving the reading readiness of children participating in the program, as was selected by the applicant; and

“(B) the applicant agrees—

“(i) to share with the Head Start programs an appropriate amount of their information resources with respect to the model, such as curricula materials; and

“(ii) to train personnel from the Head Start programs;

“(2) a contractual association with 1 or more State- or federally-funded preschool programs, or family literacy programs, under which—

“(A) the programs agree to select the same model or models of reading instruction, as a model for implementing and improving reading instruction in the program's programs, as was selected by the applicant; and

“(B) the applicant agrees to train personnel from the programs who work with children and parents in schools selected under subsection (a)(2); or

“(3) a contractual association with 1 or more public libraries providing reading or literacy services to preschool children, or preschool children and their families, under which—

“(A) the libraries agree to select the same model or models of reading instruction, as a model for implementing and improving reading instruction in the library's reading or literacy programs, as was selected by the applicant; and

“(B) the applicant agrees to train personnel, including volunteers, from such programs who work with preschool children, or preschool children and their families, in schools selected under subsection (a)(2).

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), an applicant who receives a subgrant under this section may use the subgrant funds to carry out activities that are authorized by this title and described in the subgrant application, including the following:

“(A) Making reasonable payments for technical and other assistance to a person responsible for the development of a model of reading instruction, or a person with experience or expertise about such model and its implementation, who has agreed to work with the recipient in connection with the implementation of the model.

“(B) Carrying out a contractual agreement described in subsection (d).

"(C) Professional development (including training of volunteers), purchase of curricular and other supporting materials, and technical assistance.

"(D) Providing, on a voluntary basis, training to parents of children enrolled in a school selected under subsection (a)(2) on how to help their children with school work, particularly in the development of reading skills. Such training may be provided directly by the subgrant recipient, or through a grant or contract with another person. Such training shall be consistent with reading reforms taking place in the school setting.

"(E) Carrying out family literacy programs based on the Even Start family literacy model authorized under part B of title I to enable parents to be their child's first and most important teacher, and making payments for the receipt of technical assistance for the development of such programs.

"(F) Providing instruction for parents of children enrolled in a school selected under subsection (a)(2), and others who volunteer to be reading tutors for such children, in the instructional practices based on reliable, replicable research on reading used by the applicant.

"(G) Programs to assist those kindergarten students enrolled in a school selected under subsection (a)(2) who are not ready for the transition to 1st grade, particularly students experiencing difficulty with reading skills.

"(H) Providing additional support for students, enrolled in a school selected under subsection (a)(2), in grades 1 through 3, who are experiencing difficulty reading, before school, after school, on weekends, during non-instructional periods of the school day, or during the summer using supervised individuals (including tutors), who have been appropriately trained using reliable, replicable research on reading.

"(I) Carrying out the duties described in section 15105(b)(2) for children enrolled in a school selected under subsection (a)(2).

"(J) Providing reading assistance to children who have not been determined to be a child with a disability (as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), pursuant to section 614(b)(5) of such Act, because of a lack of instruction in reading.

"(2) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A recipient of a subgrant under this section may use not more than 3 percent of the subgrant funds for administrative costs.

"(f) TRAINING NON-RECIPIENTS.—A recipient of a subgrant under this section may train, on a fee-for-service basis, personnel are from schools, or local educational agencies, that are not receiving such a subgrant in the instructional practices based on reliable, replicable research on reading used by the recipient. Such a non-recipient school may use funds received under title I of this Act, and other appropriate Federal funds used for reading instruction, to pay for such training, to the extent consistent with the law under which such funds were received.

"SEC. 15105. TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE SUBGRANTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) SUBGRANTS.—A reading and literacy partnership that receives a grant under section 15103 shall make subgrants on a competitive basis to—

"(A) local educational agencies that have at least 1 school in the geographic area served by the agency that—

"(i) is located in an area designated as an empowerment zone under part I of subchapter U of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(ii) is located in an area designated as an enterprise community under part I of subchapter U of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(B) in the case of local educational agencies that do not have any such empowerment zone or enterprise community in the State in which the agency is located, local educational agencies that have at least 1 school that is identified for school improvement under section 1116(c) in the geographic area served by the agency.

"(2) APPLICATIONS.—A local educational agency that desires to receive a subgrant under this section shall submit an application to the reading and literacy partnership at such time, in such manner, and including such information as the partnership may require. The application shall include an assurance that the agency will use the subgrant funds to carry out the duties described in subsection (b) for children enrolled in 1 or more schools selected by the agency and described in paragraph (1).

"(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency that receives a subgrant under this section shall carry out, using the funds provided under the subgrant, each of the duties described in paragraph (2).

"(2) DUTIES.—The duties described in this paragraph are the provision of tutorial assistance in reading to children who have difficulty reading, using instructional practices based on the principles of reliable, replicable research, through the following:

"(A) The promulgation of a set of objective criteria, pertaining to the ability of a tutorial assistance provider successfully to provide tutorial assistance in reading, that will be used to determine in a uniform manner, at the beginning of each school year, the eligibility of tutorial assistance providers, subject to the succeeding subparagraphs of this paragraph, to be included on the list described in subparagraph (B) (and thereby be eligible to enter into a contract pursuant to subparagraph (F)).

"(B) The promulgation, maintenance, and approval of a list of tutorial assistance providers eligible to enter into a contract pursuant to subparagraph (F) who—

"(i) have established a record of effectiveness with respect to reading readiness, reading instruction for children in kindergarten through 3d grade, and early childhood literacy;

"(ii) are located in a geographic area convenient to the school or schools attended by the children who will be receiving tutorial assistance from the providers; and

"(iii) are capable of providing tutoring in reading to children who have difficulty reading, using instructional practices based on the principles of reliable, replicable research and consistent with the instructional methods used by the school the child attends.

"(C) The development of procedures (I) for the receipt of applications for tutorial assistance, from parents who are seeking such assistance for their child or children, that select a tutorial assistance provider from the list described in subparagraph (B) with whom the child or children will enroll, for tutoring in reading; and (II) for considering children for tutorial assistance who are identified under subparagraph (D) and for whom no application has been submitted, provided that such procedures are in accordance with this paragraph and give such parents the right to select a tutorial assistance provider from the list referred to in subparagraph (B), and shall permit a local educational agency to recommend a tutorial assistance provider from the list under subparagraph (B) in a case where a parent asks for assistance in the making of such selection.

"(D) The development of a selection process for providing tutorial assistance in accordance with this paragraph that limits the provision of assistance to children identified, by the school the child attends, as having

difficulty reading, including difficulty mastering essential phonic, decoding, or vocabulary skills. In the case of a child included in the selection process for whom no application has been submitted by a parent of the child, the child's eligibility for receipt of tutorial assistance shall be determined under the same procedures, timeframe, and criteria for consideration as is used to determine the eligibility of a child whose parent has submitted such an application. Such local educational agency shall apply the provisions of subparagraphs (F) and (G) to a tutorial assistance provider selected for a child whose parent has not submitted an application pursuant to subparagraph (C)(I) in the same manner as the provisions are applied to a provider selected in an application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (C)(I).

"(E) The development of procedures for selecting children to receive tutorial assistance, to be used in cases where insufficient funds are available to provide assistance with respect to all children identified by a school under subparagraph (D) that—

"(i) gives priority to children who are determined, through State or local reading assessments, to be most in need of tutorial assistance; and

"(ii) gives priority, in cases where children are determined, through State or local reading assessments, to be equally in need of tutorial assistance, based on a random selection principle.

"(F) The development of a methodology by which payments are made directly to tutorial assistance providers who are identified and selected pursuant to subparagraphs (C) (D), and (E) that is selected for funding. Such methodology shall include the making of a contract, consistent with State and local law, between the tutorial assistance provider and the local educational agency carrying out this paragraph. Such contract—

"(i) shall contain specific goals and timetables with respect to the performance of the tutorial assistance provider;

"(ii) shall require the tutorial assistance provider to report to the parent and the local educational agency on the provider's performance in meeting such goals and timetables; and

"(iii) shall contain provisions with respect to the making of payments to the tutorial assistance provider by the local educational agency.

"(G) The development of procedures under which the local educational agency carrying out this paragraph—

"(i) will ensure oversight of the quality and effectiveness of the tutorial assistance provided by each tutorial assistance provider who is identified and selected by a parent in an application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (C) that is selected for funding;

"(ii) will remove from the list under subparagraph (B) ineffective and unsuccessful providers (as determined by the local educational agency based upon the performance of the provider with respect to the goals and timetables contained in the contract between the agency and the provider under subparagraph (F));

"(iii) will provide to each parent of a child identified under subparagraph (D) who requests such information for the purpose of selecting a tutorial assistance provider for the child, in a comprehensible format, information with respect to the quality and effectiveness of the tutorial assistance referred to in clause (i); and

"(iv) will ensure that each school identifying a child under subparagraph (D) will provide upon request, to a parent of the child, assistance in selecting, from among the tutorial assistance providers who are included on the list described in subparagraph (B), the

provider who is best able to meet the needs of the child.

“(c) DEFINITION. For the purposes of this section the term “parent” or “parents” includes a legal guardian or legal guardians of the child.

“SEC. 15106. PROGRAM EVALUATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—From funds reserved under section 15109(b)(1), the Secretary shall conduct a national assessment of the programs under this title. In developing the criteria for the assessment, the Secretary shall receive recommendations from the peer review panel convened under section 15103(f).

“(b) SUBMISSION TO PEER REVIEW PANEL.—The Secretary shall submit the findings from the assessment under subsection (a) to the peer review panel convened under section 15103(f).

“SEC. 15107. INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—From funds reserved under section 15109(b)(2), the National Institute for Literacy shall disseminate information on reliable, replicable research on reading and information on subgrantee projects under section 15104 or 15105 that have proven effective. At a minimum, the institute shall disseminate such information to all recipients of Federal financial assistance under titles I and VII of this Act, the Head Start Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the Adult Education Act.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the National Institute for Literacy—

“(1) shall use, to the extent practicable, information networks developed and maintained through other public and private persons, including the Secretary, the National Center for Family Literacy, and the Readline Program;

“(2) shall work in conjunction with any panel convened by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Secretary and any panel convened by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to assess the current status of research-based knowledge on reading development, including the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching children to read, with respect to determining the criteria by which the National Institute for Literacy judges reliable, replicable research and the design of strategies to disseminate such information; and

“(3) shall assist any reading and literacy partnership selected to receive a grant under section 15103, and that requests such assistance—

“(A) in determining whether applications for subgrants submitted to the partnership meet the requirements of this title relating to reliable, replicable research on reading; and

“(B) in the development of subgrant application forms.

“SEC. 15108. STATE EVALUATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each reading and literacy partnership that receives a grant under this title shall reserve not more than 2 percent of such grant funds for the purpose of evaluating the success of the partnership's subgrantees in meeting the purposes of this title. At a minimum, the evaluation shall measure the extent to which students who are the intended beneficiaries of the subgrants made by the partnership have improved their reading.

“(b) CONTRACT.—A reading and literacy partnership shall carry out the evaluation under this section by entering into a contract with an eligible research institution under which the institution will perform the evaluation.

“(c) SUBMISSION.—A reading and literacy partnership shall submit the findings from the evaluation under this section to the Secretary and the peer review panel convened

under section 15103(f). The Secretary and the peer review panel shall submit a summary of the findings from the evaluations under this subsection to the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Education and the Workforce Committee of the House of Representatives.

“SEC. 15109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; RESERVATIONS FROM APPROPRIATIONS; SUNSET.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$260,000,000 for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000.

“(b) RESERVATIONS.—From amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary—

“(1) shall reserve 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year to carry out section 15106(a);

“(2) shall reserve \$5,075,000 to carry out sections 15103(f)(2) and 15107, of which \$5,000,000 shall be reserved for section 15107; and

“(3) shall reserve \$10,000,000 to carry out section 1202(c).

“(c) SUNSET.—Notwithstanding section 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act, this title is repealed, effective September 30, 2000, and is not subject to extension under such section.”.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. RESERVATION FOR GRANTS.

Section 1202(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) RESERVATION FOR GRANTS.—

“(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds reserved under section 15109(b)(3), the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to States to enable such States to plan and implement, statewide family literacy initiatives to coordinate and integrate existing Federal, State, and local literacy resources consistent with the purposes of this part. Such coordination and integration shall include funds available under the Adult Education Act, Head Start, this part, part A of this title, and part A of title IV of the Social Security Act.

“(2) CONSORTIA.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—To receive a grant under this subsection, a State shall establish a consortium of State-level programs under the following laws:

“(i) This title.

“(ii) The Head Start Act.

“(iii) The Adult Education Act.

“(iv) All other State-funded preschool programs and programs providing literacy services to adults.

“(B) PLAN.—To receive a grant under this subsection, the consortium established by a State shall create a plan to use a portion of the State's resources, derived from the programs referred to in subparagraph (A), to strengthen and expand family literacy services in such State.

“(C) COORDINATION WITH TITLE XV.—The consortium shall coordinate its activities with the activities of the reading and literacy partnership for the State established under section 15103, if the State receives a grant under such section.

“(3) READING INSTRUCTION.—Statewide family literacy initiatives implemented under this subsection shall base reading instruction on reliable, replicable research on reading (as such terms are defined in section 15102).

“(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide, directly or through a grant or contract with an organization with experience in the development and operation of successful family literacy services, technical assistance to States receiving a grant under this subsection.

“(5) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall not make a grant to a State under this subsection unless the State agrees that, with respect to the costs to be incurred by the eligible consortium in carrying out the activities for which the grant was awarded, the State will make available non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than the Federal funds provided under the grant.”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1202(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the term ‘family literacy services’ means services provided to participants on a voluntary basis that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family (such as eliminating or reducing welfare dependency) and that integrate all of the following activities:

“(A) Interactive literacy activities between parents and their children.

“(B) Equipping parents to partner with their children in learning.

“(C) Parent literacy training, including training that contributes to economic self-sufficiency.

“(D) Appropriate instruction for children of parents receiving parent literacy services.”.

SEC. 203. EVALUATION.

Section 1209 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6369) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) to provide States and eligible entities receiving a subgrant under this part, directly or through a grant or contract with an organization with experience in the development and operation of successful family literacy services, technical assistance to ensure local evaluations undertaken under section 1205(10) provide accurate information on the effectiveness of programs assisted under this part.”.

SEC. 204. INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 1210 as section 1212; and

(2) by inserting after section 1209 the following:

“SEC. 1210. INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY.

“Each State receiving funds under this part shall develop, based on the best available research and evaluation data, indicators of program quality for programs assisted under this part. Such indicators shall be used to monitor, evaluate, and improve such programs within the State. Such indicators shall include the following:

“(1) With respect to eligible participants in a program who are adults—

“(A) achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving, and numeracy;

“(B) receipt of a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma;

“(C) entry into a postsecondary school, job retraining program, or employment or career advancement, including the military; and

“(D) such other indicators as the State may develop.

“(2) With respect to eligible participants in a program who are children—

“(A) improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness;

"(B) school attendance;
 "(C) grade retention and promotion; and
 "(D) such other indicators as the State may develop."

(b) STATE LEVEL ACTIVITIES.—Section 1203(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6363(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) carrying out section 1210."

(c) AWARD OF SUBGRANTS.—Paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1208(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6368) are amended to read as follows:

"(3) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—In awarding subgrant funds to continue a program under this part for the second, third, or fourth year, the State educational agency shall evaluate the program based on the indicators of program quality developed by the State under section 1210. Such evaluation shall take place after the conclusion of the start-up period, if any.

"(4) INSUFFICIENT PROGRESS.—The State educational agency may refuse to award subgrant funds if such agency finds that the eligible entity has not sufficiently improved the performance of the program, as evaluated based on the indicators of program quality developed by the State under section 1210, after—

"(A) providing technical assistance to the eligible entity; and

"(B) affording the eligible entity notice and an opportunity for a hearing."

SEC. 205. RESEARCH.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by section 204 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 1210 the following:

"SEC. 1211. RESEARCH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, through grant or contract, research into the components of successful family literacy services, to use—

"(1) to improve the quality of existing programs assisted under this part or other family literacy programs carried out under this Act or the Adult Education Act; and

"(2) to develop models for new programs to be carried out under this Act or the Adult Education Act.

"(b) DISSEMINATION.—The National Institute for Literacy shall disseminate, pursuant to section 15107, the results of the research described in subsection (a) to States and recipients of subgrants under this part."

TITLE III—FUNDS FOR FEDERAL WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. USE OF WORK-STUDY FUNDS FOR TUTORING AND LITERACY.

Section 443 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 2753) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A)

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) in academic year 1998 and succeeding academic years, an institution shall use at least 2 percent of the total amount of funds granted to such institution under this section for such academic year in accordance with subsection (d); and"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) TUTORING AND LITERACY ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) USE OF FUNDS.—In any academic year to which subsection (b)(2)(B) applies, an institution shall use the amount required to be used in accordance with this subsection to

compensate (including compensation for time spent in directly related training and travel) students—

"(A) employed as a reading tutor for children who are in preschool through elementary school; or

"(B) employed in family literacy projects.

"(2) PRIORITY FOR SCHOOLS.—An institution shall—

"(A) give priority, in using such funds, to the employment of students in the provision of tutoring services in schools that—

"(i) are identified for school improvement under section 1116(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; or

"(ii) are selected by a local educational agency under section 15104(a)(2) of such Act; and

"(B) ensure that any student compensated with such funds who is employed in a school selected under section 15104(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is trained in the instructional practices based on reliable, replicable research on reading used by the school pursuant to such section 15104.

"(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the compensation of work study students compensated under this subsection may exceed 75 percent.

"(4) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of this subsection if the Secretary determines that enforcing such requirements would cause a hardship for students at the institution.

"(5) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Any institution that does not use the amount required under this subsection, and that does not request and receive a waiver from the Secretary under paragraph (4), shall return to the Secretary, at such time as the Secretary may require for reallocation under paragraph (6), any balance of such amount that is not used as so required.

"(6) REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall reallocate any amounts returned pursuant to paragraph (5) among institutions that used at least 4 percent of the total amount of funds granted to such institution under this section to compensate students employed in tutoring and literacy activities in the preceding academic year. Such funds shall be reallocated among such institutions on the same basis as excess eligible amounts are allocated to institutions pursuant to section 442(c). Funds received by institutions pursuant to this paragraph shall be used in the same manner as amounts required to be used in accordance with this subsection."

TITLE IV—REPEALS

SEC. 401. REPEAL OF CERTAIN UNFUNDED EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ADULT EDUCATION ACT.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, LABOR, AND EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS FOR WORKPLACE LITERACY.—Section 371 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1211).

(2) ENGLISH LITERACY GRANTS.—Section 372 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1211a).

(3) EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR COMMERCIAL DRIVERS.—Section 373 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1211b).

(4) ADULT LITERACY VOLUNTEER TRAINING.—Section 382 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213a).

(b) CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND APPLIED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACT.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) BUSINESS-LABOR-EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP FOR TRAINING.—Part D of title III of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2391 et seq.).

(2) SUPPLEMENTARY STATE GRANTS FOR FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AND OTHER PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Part F of title III

of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2395 et seq.).

(3) COMMUNITY EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT CENTERS AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LIGHTHOUSE SCHOOLS.—Part G of title III of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2396 et seq.).

(4) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Part B of title IV of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.).

(5) CERTAIN BILINGUAL PROGRAMS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 441 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2441).

(c) COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS.—The Community School Partnership Act (contained in part B of title V of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 1070 note)) is repealed.

(d) EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Section 941(j) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 6041(j)) is repealed.

(e) ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) INNOVATIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TRANSITION PROJECTS.—Section 1503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6493).

(2) SCHOOL DROPOUT ASSISTANCE.—Part C of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7261 et seq.).

(3) IMPACT AID PROGRAM.—Section 8006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7706) is repealed.

(4) SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIAN CHILDREN.—Subpart 2 of part A of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7831 et seq.).

(5) SPECIAL PROGRAMS RELATING TO ADULT EDUCATION FOR INDIANS.—Subpart 3 of part A of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7851 et seq.).

(6) FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.—Subpart 5 of part A of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7871 et seq.).

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 9162(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7882(c)).

(8) DE LUGO TERRITORIAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Part H of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8221 et seq.).

(9) EXTENDED TIME FOR LEARNING AND LONGER SCHOOL YEAR.—Part L of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8351).

(10) TERRITORIAL ASSISTANCE.—Part M of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8371).

(f) FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENDEAVOR SCHOOLS.—The Family and Community Endeavor Schools Act (42 U.S.C. 13792) is repealed.

(g) GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT.—Subsections (b) and (d)(1) of section 601 of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5951) are repealed.

(h) HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS FOR TEACHER EXCELLENCE.—Part A of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1102 et seq.).

(2) NATIONAL TEACHER ACADEMIES.—Part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1103 et seq.).

(3) CLASS SIZE DEMONSTRATION GRANT.—Subpart 3 of part D of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1109 et seq.).

(4) MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Subpart 4 of part D of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1110 et seq.).

(5) SMALL STATE TEACHING INITIATIVE.—Subpart 5 of part F of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1115).

(6) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TRAINING.—Subpart 5 of part F of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1117 et seq.).

(7) GRANTS TO STATES FOR WORKPLACE AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION TRAINING FOR INCARCERATED YOUTH OFFENDERS.—Part E of title X of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1135g).

(i) HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1992.—Part E of title XV of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (20 U.S.C. 1070 note) is repealed.

(j) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) CAREER ADVANCEMENT TRAINING CONSORTIA.—Subsection (e) of section 302 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 771a(e)).

(2) VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Section 303 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 772).

(3) LOAN GUARANTEES FOR COMMUNITY REHABILITATION PROGRAMS.—Section 304 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 773).

(4) COMPREHENSIVE REHABILITATION CENTERS.—Section 305 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 775).

(5) SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Subsections (b) and (e) of section 311 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 777a(b) and (e)).

(6) READER SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE BLIND.—Section 314 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 777d).

(7) INTERPRETER SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF.—Section 315 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 777e).

(8) COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Section 611 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 795).

(9) BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Part D of title VI of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 795r).

(10) CERTAIN DEMONSTRATION ACTIVITIES.—

(A) TRANSPORTATION SERVICES GRANTS.—Subsection (a) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(a)).

(B) PROJECTS TO ACHIEVE HIGH QUALITY PLACEMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(b)).

(C) EARLY INTERVENTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Subsection (c) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(c)).

(D) TRANSITION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Subsection (d) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(d)).

(E) BARRIERS TO SUCCESSFUL REHABILITATION OUTCOMES FOR MINORITIES.—Subsection (e) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(e)).

(F) STUDIES, SPECIAL PROJECTS, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO STUDY MANAGEMENT AND SERVICE DELIVERY.—Subsection (f) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(f)).

(G) NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REHABILITATION SERVICES.—Subsection (h) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(h)).

(H) MODEL PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES SYSTEMS.—Subsection (i) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(i)).

(I) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO UPGRADE WORKER SKILLS.—Subsection (j) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(j)).

(J) MODEL SYSTEMS REGARDING SEVERE DISABILITIES.—Subsection (k) of section 802 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797a(k)).

(11) CERTAIN TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—

(A) DISTANCE LEARNING THROUGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 803 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797b(a)).

(B) TRAINING REGARDING IMPARTIAL HEARING OFFICERS.—Subsection (d) of section 803 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797b(d)).

(C) RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF URBAN PERSONNEL.—Subsection (e) of section 803 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 797b(e)).

(k) STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.—Subtitle A of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11421 et seq.) is repealed.

(l) TECHNOLOGY-RELATED ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1988.—Subtitle B of title II of the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals With Disabilities Act of 1988 (29 U.S.C. 2241 et seq.) is repealed.

(m) NATIONAL LITERACY ACT OF 1991.—Section 304 of the National Literacy Act of 1991 (20 U.S.C. 1213c note) is repealed.

(n) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INDIAN EDUCATION.—Section 9162(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7882(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) SUBPART 4.—For the purpose of carrying out subpart 4 of this part, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Education such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 and each of the four succeeding fiscal years.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. GOODING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2614, the Reading Excellence Act. The issue of literacy has been one of my main interests since I came to this body. Over the years I have had an opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner with many members of the committee to develop legislation directed at improving the literacy of our Nation's citizens no matter what their age. While the Even Start program, the Family Literacy Program, is high on my literacy list of achievements, I would also include changes to the Adult Education Act and the National Literacy Act.

Today we have an opportunity to support a refinement and an improvement of all existing literacy programs, the Reading Excellence Act, which will help ensure that individuals of all ages have literacy skills they need to lead productive lives. Over the years what has been missing from our efforts has been a focus of preventing reading difficulties from developing in the first place. The bill addresses this problem.

As Members know, there was a budget agreement. The budget agreement said that the President will have a literacy bill. It is our responsibility then as an authorizing committee, we did not participate in the budget agreement, but it is our responsibility then to make sure that whatever that literacy bill is, it is a well thought out literacy bill and a bill that will work. And so having that in mind, I looked at the President's bill and then I decided on what areas we should really concentrate on if we are going to improve literacy in this country.

□ 1600

The general outline then became, one, make sure that the teachers have the help they need to effectively teach reading based on reliable, replicable research, including phonics.

Now I want to make sure that what everyone should understand, we are not dictating any one way of teaching reading. Anybody that does that is asking for trouble. If they are going to teach whole language and nothing else, I will guarantee my colleagues it will be a disaster. If they are going to teach look-see, which they tried in the 1960's, that is really going to be a disaster. But what we are saying is that they should use reading readiness, reading based on reliable, replicable research, including phonics.

The second idea then would be reading readiness of the child. No first grade child should fail. It is the adult that fails, not the child. No first grade child should ever be socially promoted. That is a disaster for a child. So it is the adult that failed, not the child, so we have to find a way to deal with that issue, and what we do then is say that if a child is not ready for first grade, do not push them into first grade; that the kindergarten teacher certainly knows whether they are or are not reading-ready. If they are not, then give them the kind of effort that they need to make sure that they are reading-ready in the first place.

Second, we know that the parents are the first and most important teacher, and if they are not capable, they do not have the literacy skills themselves, then we should make sure that they do.

Third, we say that reading readiness of the child beyond first grade will be dealt with mentors and with help from outside, helping the teacher, not bringing in expensive people doing their own thing, but having people from the college work program spend more of their time helping in the community rather than emptying trash cans.

Next we say that title I schools are the most in need since we have a very little bit amount of money. Those title I schools that need the help the most would be the people who would be able to get these grants.

So we talk about reading readiness of the child, we talk about preparation of the teacher, we talk about tutorial assistance, we talk about college work-study help, and we talk about those schools most in need.

Now what I want to point out is that it is not a new program. We are trying to improve the existing literacy programs that are out there. Second, I want to again make sure my colleagues understand what we are saying is it is the budget agreement that made the decision that there would be a literacy program, and our committee is trying to make sure it is the best.

Having given that outline, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], with the help of the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and others went to

work and filled in this outline to make sure that we would have something that could be accepted by all, and I believe we have come up with that initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Let me start out by saying that during the early part of this session, the President's America Reads legislation was introduced by the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], myself and many other of our Democratic colleagues. That initiative focused on the use of community-based volunteer efforts that would provide additional assistance to children after school, on weekends and during the summer, with the goal of ensuring that all children can read independently by the end of the third grade. I want to commend the President for his leadership in not only putting forth this legislation, but for realizing the need to involve community-based organizations and volunteers in the goal of increased literacy for children.

Mr. Speaker, due to the budget agreement which was struck between President Clinton and congressional leaders, Republicans and Democratic Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the administration have engaged in many months of negotiations with the collective aim of producing a bipartisan literacy initiative that combines the ideas of the President and our committee colleagues. In these many months we have produced what I believe is a very balanced and truly bipartisan agreement which is before us today.

Through the coupling of the President's ideas and those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], we have produced a bill that will positively impact the efforts of our country's educators in teaching children to read. This legislation, through both efforts to improve professional development of teachers in reading and the utilization of community-based organizations in the mobilization of volunteer tutors, will enable us to ensure that children will read independently by the end of the third grade. This is truly a goal which all of us can support.

This bill provides the much needed assistance for teachers to receive professional development in teaching children to read more effectively, and it will ensure that professional development is based on reliable, replicable research; in other words, proven methods of reading instruction.

During our committee's hearings on childhood literacy, we heard a large amount of testimony that what the teachers who teach reading want the most is professional development giving them effective strategies in instructing children to read. This bill will enable school districts to begin to fulfill that need.

In addition, this bill includes the priority of the President stated in his America Reads legislation to provide additional help to children learning to read through volunteer tutoring before and after school, on weekends and during the summer.

Huge success stories have happened across the country in communities which are already using the America Reads volunteer structure to ensure literate children, and this bill allows these successes to continue and grow in number. This will mean that more children who are struggling with one of the most basic and necessary components of our society will get the extra help outside the classroom that they so desperately need.

This legislation also includes provisions allowing for tutorial assistance grants. As Members know, this section of the bill has generated a significant amount of controversy and has been the object of numerous negotiation sessions between the Members over the last few weeks, including right up to the minute that this bill was presented on the floor. These negotiations have added what I believe is the key missing component of accountability, both educational and financial results. This is accomplished through the insistence that local educational agencies which provide tutorial education assistance grants must enter into contracts with tutorial assistance providers. This contracting authority includes specific goals, outcomes and timetables for student achievement, which gives local education agencies the tools to ensure that this program will help those children most in need. So I believe that this section of the bill is vastly improved and now a positive addition to the overall program.

I strongly believe that the legislation before us today will truly help children to read independently by the end of the third grade and grasp the essential literacy components necessary for employment in our technologically advanced society. I also believe that Members of both parties should feel confident that this legislation balances the two very important needs in assuring childhood literacy, strong professional development for reading teachers and additional tutoring assistance before and after school, on weekends and during the summer.

I urge all Members to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the subcommittee chairman who helped put the meat on the skeleton that I provided.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me, and the first thing I want to do is recommend to my colleagues that this is important legislation deserving of their support. I have had several of my Republican colleagues ask me if this is legislation

that I intend to support, and the answer to that is an emphatic yes. And if I can just back up for a moment and sort of walk my colleagues through the process, my colleagues will recall that the bipartisan agreement to balance the budget sets aside \$260 million for a new Federal literacy initiative. I suspect that most people, obviously, in this Chamber supported that agreement, voted for it on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. We then set about crafting the details of that initiative fleshing it out, if my colleagues will, and had a spirited, bipartisan give and take as to the proper approach in spending that money.

The President wanted his America Reads initiative, which would have led to a tremendous expansion of AmeriCorps, the National Service Corps Corp., and on our side of the aisle we insisted that a majority of the money be used for teacher training and to provide parents and guardians of children who have reading difficulties, who are consistently reading below grade level and behind their peers, with tutorial assistance grants. Our legislation would invest this Federal taxpayer money in family literacy as well, trying to help illiterate or semiliterate parents obtain literacy skills so that they can work with their children, because, after all, that parent is that child's first and best teacher.

We also use the money for college work program tutors. These are young people who are at institutions of higher learning, and in the process of obtaining a higher education, a college education, are getting assistance through the college work/study program, and we think that these young people are in an ideal position to fulfill their obligations under the college work/study program by helping young people learn to read better. So we want a lot of the college students participating in the college work/study program to serve as reading tutors and mentors to young people.

We also put a lot of the money into basic grants to States to improve teacher training, helping the, if my colleagues will, the teachers learn to teach better. We heard repeatedly during the course of our hearings both here in Washington, at the two literacy summits that I conducted in my congressional district, from veteran, experienced classroom teachers the need to improve their teaching skills. We had teachers, colleagues, tell us in the course of the hearings that they had never received the proper instruction in teaching reading, if my colleagues can imagine, and I know that speaks volumes about traditional teacher education at colleges and universities.

We would like to address that problem. Perhaps we can address it in a bigger way when we get around to the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. But at least here in this bill we have made a start by providing grants to States and local school districts in those school districts that have the

most glaring need. It is documented by the fact they have the most title I students, they have the most so-called school improvement sites, and it is at those schools and with those students that we want to help teachers, classroom teachers, reading specialists, obtain the best training based on reliable, replicable research in order to do a better job teaching our young people.

And lastly, as I said, we also provide money for parents and legal guardians to obtain tutorial assistance for their children in those instances where a child needs more intensive, one-on-one type of reading instruction from a tutor that they are not able to obtain during the course of a school day, and we say that those grants can be used by parents and guardians to obtain tutoring services from a list of approved and recommended tutors by the local school districts.

So I think what we have crafted here is a good, balanced bill, one that fulfills the obligation that we have on the authorizing committee to come up with the details of the authorizing legislation to spend the \$260 million set aside for the budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2614, the Reading Excellence Act.

As a parent and former school board member, I have been alarmed over recent statistics on the number of children experiencing reading difficulties.

I am particularly saddened because I know that poor reading skills are a sign of impending academic difficulties of a much broader nature which can diminish the ability of such children to grow into productive, contributing members of society.

We know, for instance, that 50 percent of our current adult population read at the bottom two of five levels of literacy. Not surprisingly, 43 percent of those in the lowest literacy level live in poverty; 17 percent are receiving food stamps, and 70 percent are unemployed or underemployed. In addition, more than two-thirds of unwed parents, school dropouts, and those arrested have below average literacy levels. We need to act now to prevent the same type of statistics for future generations.

Over the August recess, I had the opportunity to hold two literacy summits in my congressional district. These summits were attended by individuals with a wide range of involvement in literacy activities—from those individuals working with preschool children, to teachers in elementary school, to family literacy providers, to programs working with adults.

What I found was a general agreement among summit participants that there is a need to improve the teaching of reading in our country and to provide teachers with current research on how children learn to read.

Today, millions of children are on the path toward a life of illiteracy and underachievement. This legislation provides hope for these children by giving them the opportunity to obtain the reading skills necessary to lead productive lives.

H.R. 2614 responds to the concerns raised by my constituents and other individuals who testified before our committee or who contacted us to discuss this topic. It not only focuses on providing training to teachers based

on the most reliable, replicable research on reading, it calls for the dissemination of such information to all teachers in Federal programs with a strong focus on improving the reading skills of children. This will ensure these teachers, as well as those directly assisted under this act will have the tools necessary to effectively teach reading to some of the Nation's most disadvantaged school children.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will act as a companion to our recently enacted reform of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by seeking to ensure that children who are identified as not being disabled but still being unable to read will receive assistance to become literate.

Among these children are those who have historically been placed in special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Prior to this year's amendments to IDEA, many children with reading problems were identified as learning disabled when their real problem was simply not being taught to read.

Being spared special education will save those children years of misguided assistance, but it will not solve the problem that led to the special education referral in the first place, that is, not being able to read. The Reading Excellence Act will ensure that these children, and others, are provided the reading instruction necessary to become literate.

This legislation also focuses on expanding the number of family literacy programs and providing assistance to children so they can be their child's first and most important teacher. I commend the chairman for all of his work on the issue of family literacy. I believe this approach to be one of the more effective approaches to helping to break the cycle of illiteracy in many families.

Another important aspect of this legislation is a provision which will expand quality tutoring assistance for economically disadvantaged children. We have worked with our Democrat colleagues to strengthen accountability under these grants and make other clarifying changes outlined by Chairman GOODLING. Specifically, this act would allow local educational agencies to compete for funds to provide tutorial assistance grants [TAG's]. These grants would be targeted to parents with children who have significant reading difficulties and attend a school which is within an empowerment zone or enterprise community. Using these funds, parents could choose, from among a list of qualified providers, a tutor who they feel is best suited to help their children learn to read.

To ensure that tutors are able to provide high quality services, the act requires the local education agency to compile and maintain a list of qualified tutors. To be placed on this list, tutors must have a proven track record in reading readiness, early childhood literacy and reading instruction for children in grades K-3 and must commit to providing instruction based upon reliable teaching methods—such as phonics-based instruction—that have produced results supported by replicable research.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to make a significant difference in the future of many children who currently are unable to read. I urge my colleagues to seize upon this opportunity and support the Reading Excellence Act.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for their hard work and commitment to this bipartisan bill. I also want to recognize our ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and Mr. MILLER for strongly negotiating through the process our commitment to different new provisions to strengthen, I think, an existing program. So I think both sides here have worked together to craft a very, very strong bill.

Yesterday we worked in a bipartisan way to pass new ideas with a charter school bill for public choice and public education. Today we are working in a bipartisan way to strengthen the existing literacy program.

I rise in strong support of this bill, both for policy reasons and for some very, very substantive reasons which are included in this bill. First of all, in the policy reasons, again, we are not recreating the wheel, we are not coming up with a brand new program here, we are trying to find ways to improve the existing program and work with parents and teachers and volunteers and professionals to solve one of the most vexing and heartbreaking problems in America today: illiteracy.

□ 1615

It hurts businesses, costing them billions of dollars when they do not get the right kinds of employees coming out of our high schools that can read. It hurts parents who cannot read appropriately to their children. It certainly hurts children's self-esteem when they fall behind.

This bill comes up with new ideas to fix an existing problem and to improve an existing program.

What are these ideas? First of all, we focus on young children, in the kindergarten and the first grade. Next year, in the Head Start Program, we hope to move it even further, closer to 2 and 3 and 4 years old and earlier in their education.

Second, we stress family literacy, encouraging the parent to work as the child's first teacher and encouraging parents to develop literacy skills.

Third, we require States to have a professional development program for teachers. Teachers have to learn new ways. When the first way they are teaching the child doesn't work, they have to be able to teach in alternative ways.

Fourth, we encourage community-based programs, reading programs, and we require commitment from colleges that participate in the college work-study program to work as volunteers.

This is a comprehensive way to address literacy. We are doing it in a bipartisan way. We are fixing an old program with new ideas. I strongly encourage Members on both the Republican side and the Democratic side to vote for and pass this bipartisan program.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Ms. ROUKEMA], a very active member of our committee in this area, a former teacher, and very helpful in putting the legislation together.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman and ranking member for this wonderful contribution on an issue that is so essential for all Americans. This is a bill that deserves enthusiastic support.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is another issue that bothers the American people as much as the question of education and how it affects their families. This represents real progress with this legislation.

Studies have shown, I might as well repeat this, it has been stated, but studies have shown that 40 percent of the Nation's fourth graders are below basic reading skills. That is something that has to be improved.

I know there are those here that want to give volunteer help through AmeriCorps. That is not the issue here today, because there is not a principal or educator in this country who would turn away volunteers. But they would also say that the most important essential need is that we train, have real reading training for teachers in the classroom. That is what this bill does. It gives that assistance to the classroom teacher and gives that training.

Mr. Speaker, I think the bill, of course, also helps lower-income parents and gives them the opportunity to gain remedial assistance, which of course we also know is important.

I would like to say, especially to my conservative friends, fellow fiscal conservative friends, I might say, because I am one of those too, I want us to know that 95 percent of the funding authorized in this legislation is driven right down into the classroom. It is not eaten up in bureaucratic overhead and administration. I think that is important for all of us to know.

Finally, I will conclude with my own commitment, as a teacher, a mother, in saying that without reading, there is no learning, and without learning, there is no education; without education, our Nation cannot compete in this increasingly competitive global economy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all the members of the committee for this very fine contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Reading Excellence Act and commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman GOODLING, for his strong leadership in this area.

Among the many laudable sections of the budget and tax cut package this Congress approved in July was an additional \$260 million to enhance literacy. Heaven knows we need it.

Recent studies have shown that 40 percent of the Nation's fourth graders possess below-

basic reading skills. Now there are many societal and educational reasons for this—but time will not allow a complete discussion here.

Quite frankly, I have been a bit puzzled by the President's approach to this new literacy program. He proposed to spend the \$260 million to send an army of barely trained paid volunteers from AmeriCorps in to low-income schools to serve as reading tutors.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a principal in this country who would turn away new volunteers at his or her school.

That's what this bill does: gives the assistance to those in the best position to make a difference—the classroom teacher.

The legislation Mr. GOODLING and our Education Committee approved emphasizes helping teachers to teach reading. This bill is grounded in the basics, and ensures that reliable and replicable research on reading techniques, such as phonics, actually reaches the classroom.

Our bill also will give lower-income parents the opportunity to gain remedial assistance for their children from trained and approved reading tutors.

To do all this, the bill creates a new system, which allows for reading and literacy partnerships—a State entity—to compete for literacy grants to use toward innovative reading programs.

Now let me close with a few words for my fellow fiscal conservatives. I want you to know that 95-percent of the funding authorized by this legislation is driven right into the classroom. It is not eaten up in bureaucratic overhead and administration.

It would add that this legislation also repeals 67 unfunded Federal Department of Education programs.

As a member of the Education Committee since coming to Congress, I have said that we need to undertake a clear-eyed evaluation of every educational program on the books, determine what works and fully fund them and get rid of the rest. This legislation moves us in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, mother of three and grandmother of five there is no more fundamental reform we can adopt to give the next generation a successful future.

Without reading, there is no learning. Without learning, there is no education. Without education, our Nation cannot compete in an increasingly competitive global economy.

We must do this for our children and our children's children. I thank the chairman and urge support for this legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Martinez, California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for yielding to me, from Martinez, and I thank him for his work on this legislation, and I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and, again, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for all of the effort to bring this legislation to the floor and to make it a true bipartisan effort.

There have been very intensive negotiations around this legislation. I think those negotiations have been intense

because, as the gentleman from New Jersey just said, we believe this is one of the most important subjects that we confront as members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and that is our ability to improve the outcomes for our young children in school to learn to read so that they can read to learn for the rest of their lives.

As so many have already said here today, we are not doing a very good job in that effort. I think this legislation starts to turn us around in that. In terms of the emphasis that it places on the professional development of teachers, it is clear that we have got to have competent, capable teachers in that classroom, spending time with those children to help them learn to read.

It is clear that we have got to get the parents of these children involved in reading to their children and encouraging their children and rewarding their children for reading competency. It is also very clear that we have got to call upon additional volunteers to come to our schools and to spend time with the children.

I notice today in Roll Call magazine some of our colleagues in the U.S. Senate spending time on Capitol Hill. Senator DURBIN from Illinois was pictured at Brent School, reading to a young man, trying to encourage that young man to improve his reading proficiency so he could have a successful education.

Mr. Speaker, I spent an awful lot of time with young adolescents in my local high schools where I teach a couple of classes for young children and young students in the continuation high school and also in a honors class at another high school. Every Monday morning, we talk about some of these issues. And I cannot tell you the sadness the young people express and how cheated they feel that they cannot read to grade level and how angry they are about social promotions and being told that they are doing fine, they are getting C's, and they will be OK, and now to realize as they are 10th and 11th graders, that they really cannot read.

It has got to stop. We have got to make this a determinant of your ability to proceed in education. We have got to bring the resources. This bill does that. It allows us to go out and to contract with tutors, to bring additional emphasis and resources on those children that are having difficulty.

Hopefully, schools will get better at identifying those children and the problems they have, and we can start to eliminate the great number of children who are falling behind their reading proficiency at grade level. We will be able to identify those problems and get those children up to grade level so they can have a successful education.

Unless we do that, Mr. Speaker, we simply are not going to improve the American education experience for millions of children that we need as competent children, as capable children, and as graduates of an education system that allows them to take their place in American society.

I would hope that the House would overwhelmingly pass this bipartisan legislation to improve America's reading education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], a valuable member of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and commend him and the leaders on both sides of the committee for the hard work they have done on this very important issue.

I do not think there is any issue facing America that is more important to our future than to somehow improve our educational system to where every Johnny and Susie when they leave school are good readers.

I will have to be honest, I was not excited when I saw the budget agreement that called for another new reading literacy program, but I am pleased with the work that has been done with existing programs and in streamlining this one to get the money to our schools.

But I will say this: I do not think we will solve the literacy problem in this country just with Federal initiatives. We need a commitment from our school boards and our superintendents and principals that no child will leave their school without good reading skills, and, without that commitment, no State or Federal money will solve this problem. We need that commitment at the local level.

But I come to the floor today to support the Reading Excellence Act. This act brings only successful components of education together, the school, the teacher, the parents, and, most importantly, the child.

This focuses on providing teachers and tutors with better tools. The Reading Excellence Act provides parents with the ability to better their child's opportunity to make the grade in reading. Through the tutorial assistance grants, Johnny and Susie's parents will be able to pick from a list of programs in order to find the right program for the needs of their children. I think that is one of the most important parts of this bill. When we stop and think about it, where did we learn to read? It was a combination of school and home and family members.

Another important aspect of this bill is where children are having difficulties as a result of a family environment. This act provides literacy assistance to the child's parents, allowing them to become their child's first and foremost teacher. It directs the funds to the local level, where only true educational reform happens. This measure strengthens our teachers and their teaching methods.

Finally, we ensure that parents remain the key element in the education equation, providing them with literacy assistance, allowing them, the parents, the decision process for their child, ensuring that parents become the premier teachers.

With this bill we only provide tools, but we still need the commitment of the school superintendents and directors back home that no child will leave their school without good literacy skills.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], a long time proponent of reading from his library background.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Chairman GOODLING], and all the others who have negotiated this piece of legislation.

There were some serious differences, and for a moment I thought maybe the children of America would be denied this small effort because of those differences, and I do not think it is good to do that and wait another year while the inaccuracy of the teaching of reading goes forward.

I was shocked to learn that most of the teachers in our schools have never been trained to teach reading. There was an article on the New York Times editorial page which said the overwhelming majority of teachers have never been taught to teach reading and there is a need to have some kind of instruction on how to do that. It will improve the job.

So the children who will benefit from this need it now. We cannot hesitate and wait. We should go on and do all we can. So this is one more small effort to improve education in America.

It is just that, a small effort. This is like dipping from the lake of inadequacy with a teacup. This is a small program. It is \$200 million. It may sound like a lot of money out there, but a nuclear submarine costs more than \$2 billion.

If we are really going to deal with the problem of teaching reading, we ought to try to make an impact on the schools of education with some kind of Federal program in the future. I do not know whether it costs as much as a nuclear submarine or not, probably not, but it would require a bigger effort than this one.

This is a good effort. It is a good pilot program, and it ought to go forward. It brings in a lot of different elements, all of which I think ought to be brought in. Common sense dictates that you should use what you have at hand, and this is a good common sense effort.

But in order to really deal with the problem, I hope that these pilot programs and these good common sense efforts are only a prelude to this Congress going ahead in the future to deal with the overwhelming problem of in-

adequate and substandard education in America.

The war against substandard education cannot be fought by some rifle corps going out. That helps. This is a little operation where we are sending out a few platoons to deal with the problem. We need a real war on substandard education.

A real war means you deal with basic problems, like school construction. School construction is a basic problem out there. We need \$120 billion to deal with the infrastructure of schools all across America. Even if you do not get nearly that much, we ought to do better than we have done so far.

To say we are going to teach reading better and make efforts to teach reading or to improve technological instruction or provide more technology in the schools, when the kids are still up against the problem where the boilers are breaking down in the schools and they have to go to school and bundle up in order to stay warm, and that does not just happen in Washington, D.C., there are a number of schools all across America that have problems in terms of heat.

So we should see this as a wonderful prelude, as an indication that the Congress cares. But we are just beginning to deal with the bigger problem. We are just beginning to fight the war. These are little patrols that we are sending out to reconnoiter, to scout out the problem. The problem is much bigger, and beyond this program on reading, which is about \$200 million, \$210 million, we need to have a comprehensive approach to education, stimulated and guided by the Congress of the United States, despite the fact that the primary responsibility for education is at the local level.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, we can provide the leadership, we can provide the stimulation. We will never be responsible for education. That is a matter for the States, but we can go beyond the 8 percent of education expenditures and move on to a more important role in leading the fight to really wage a war against substandard education in America. This is the beginning, but let us get ready to fight a bigger war next year.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], another important member of our committee.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition to the Reading Excellence Act, which creates yet another unconstitutional, ineffective, \$260 million new Federal education program.

I do not challenge the motivation of those who today bring this bill to the floor. The supporters of this bill claim that by passing the Reading Excellence Act, the Federal Government will, quote, enable every child to learn to read, end of quote.

Now, this is certainly a noble goal, but before Congress creates yet another Federal program, perhaps we should consider that over the past 60 years Congress has created a plethora of social programs, each one promising to bring to an end all the social ills. These programs have not only failed to create the promised utopia, but in many cases worsened the very problems they were created to solve.

Nowhere is the Federal Government's failure to improve the lives of the American people through the welfare state more dramatically illustrated than in education. In 1963, when Federal spending on education was less than \$900,000, the average Scholastic Achievement Test score was approximately 980. Thirty years later, when Federal education spending ballooned to \$19 billion, the average score fell to 902.

Furthermore, according to the National Assessment of Education Progress Survey, only 37 percent of America's 12th graders were actually able to read at a 12th grade level. Despite this history of failed Federal programs, Congress is once again planning to solve a social problem it helped create through an increase in Federal power.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the reason we are considering this bill is because the budget agreement, which was supposed to end the era of big government, calls for the creation of a Federal literacy program. Obviously, the budget does not end big government, but preserves and expands unconstitutional State interference in areas where the Federal Government has neither legitimacy nor competence.

Rather than returning money and authority to the States and the people, commensurate with the 10th amendment, this bill creates another complex bureaucratic process, laden with rules, regulations, and State mandates. Under this bill, States receiving a literacy grant must establish a reading and literacy partnership, the markup of which is dictated by the Federal Government. The partnership must then apply for a grant to the Secretary of Education, explaining how they would comply with all of the bill's mandates. The grants are then approved by a Peer Review Panel, a group of experts chosen by the National Institute for Literacy and other federally funded organizations. States receiving grants under this program would then have to distribute those grants to Local Education Agencies [LEA's] who submit a plan to the States' reading and literacy partnership. Among the information that States would be required to submit is a description of how subgrants made by the partnership would achieve the goals of the act, a description of how the partnership would evaluate subgrantees, and a description of how states will guarantee that a portion of the funds will be used to provide tutorial assistance grants.

Those receiving Federal literacy funds may only use them for federally defined purposes. Thus, this legislation creates another bureaucratized program rooted in pseudofederalism, whereby States have the right to spend money on federally defined goals and within the limitations set by Congress—provided, of course, they jump through all the congressionally constructed Federal hoops.

Recipients of Federal literacy funds must base their programs on reliable, replicable research, defined as research meeting scientific standards of peer-review. While none question the value of research into various educational methodologies it is doubtful that the best way to teach reading can be totally determined through laboratory experiments. Learning to read is a complex process, involving many variable, not the least of which are the skills and abilities of the individual child. Many effective techniques may not be readily supported by reliable, replicable research. Therefore, this program may end up preventing the use of many effective means of reading instruction. The requirement that recipients of Federal funds use only those reading techniques based on reliable, replicable research, which in practice means those methods approved by the federally funded experts on the Peer Review Panel, ensures that a limited number of reading methodologies will, in essence, be stamped with Federal approval.

Furthermore, this bill mandates that schools participating in the Federal literacy programs must make available to parents assurance of teacher qualifications. It is probably a good idea that local schools make this information available to parents, but it not the role of the Federal Government to dictate local schools implement everything we in Congress think is a good idea. In addition, this provision seems to have been motivated by a desire to start Congress down the road to establishing a national system to certify teachers.

Due to the unfortunate influence of the Federal Government, the teaching methodologies funded under this program will become the methodologies used in every classroom in the Nation. Thus, this bill represents another step toward imposing a national curriculum. Supporters of this bill will respond that the Federal Government is merely encouraging the use of sound instructional techniques. Setting aside the question of whether or not techniques based on reliable, replicable research can really lead one to discover the best means of educating children, the Constitution prohibits the Federal Government from any interference in the methodologies by which children are educated. This constitutional prohibition on Federal interference in education contains no exception for techniques based on reliable, replicable, research.

Mr. Speaker, another indication that this bill will move America toward a national curriculum is that the bill creates a Federal definition of reading, thus making compliance with Federal standards the goal of education.

Furthermore, the Reading Excellence Act requires each grantee to evaluate the success of their programs. Of course, the most effective way to evaluate the success of the various literacy projects reviewing Federal funds is to administer a uniform test to the students participating in those programs. Thus, despite the overwhelming congressional rejection of national testing just last month, Congress is now considering authorizing the creation of a de facto national reading exam.

Another reason to oppose this bill is that it increases Federal support for a so-called family literacy services. One of the hallmark of totalitarianism is State-control of child rearing. Despite the language that participation in these programs is voluntary, these programs enable government-funded social workers to subtly coerce parents to cede control of their child to the State.

Mr. Speaker, the Reading Excellence Act represents another unconstitutional intrusion on the rights of States, local communities, and parents to educate children free

from Federal interference. It also takes several large steps down the dangerous road toward a national curriculum. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, and instead support measures such as educational tax credit that will empower parents to provide effective literacy instruction for their children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], another important member of the committee, who helped turn things around in Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank all of those who worked on this legislation.

I am pleased to see almost near harmony with respect to support of this. I cannot imagine anything as important as teaching young people, and even older people for that matter, how to read. It is significant, be it the simple act of being able to read traffic signs or being able just to get around, to reading manuals, to higher education, or the simple pleasures of being able to read a book and to escape to some fantasy as a result of that reading is one of the tremendous necessities and pleasures in the life of anybody in this world, and we want our American citizens to be able to do it.

The President, I think, was on the right track to recognize the power and importance of literacy when he announced his literacy initiative, but I think his focus was a little bit misguided in terms of having volunteers, who are certainly a very important component in ascertaining a level of reading in children, but we have to go beyond that, I believe. My office indeed has been involved as volunteers in the Everybody Wins program, where staff go to Tyler Elementary right up the street here and read with their children to whom they are assigned once a week, and it makes a huge difference as far as the kids are concerned.

But the problem is more fundamental than trying to get children to like reading. It rests in the fact that many children simply cannot translate the written word into the spoken word. They lack basic decoding and literacy skills. Scarce Federal dollars should be focused on the most basic solution to the literacy problem.

For a problem like this, I think teacher training is imperative. Reading teachers need to learn the best methods for teaching reading based on reliable, replicable research. By giving children the basic building blocks of literacy, learning how to sound out the written word, they will be well on their way to becoming literate adults, and that is exactly what this legislation does, as has been described today.

Under this bill, States, through reading and literacy programs, will compete for literacy grants to use for innovative, in-service reading programs for classroom teachers and related reading activities based on the best research available, and I cannot think of anything which is better to do.

Instilling in our young people the ability to read is absolute. This legislation helps do that, and I am again very

thankful for all of those who put it together and hope that we all can support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP], who worked hard in the State legislature to improve education.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise and am pleased to rise in support of the Reading Excellence Act. While we are all concerned about new Federal programs, the budget agreement set aside \$260 million for a new literacy program. What we could have had is another feel-good, unproven, sounds-good program, the kind of program that has failed our children so badly.

Mr. Speaker, 44 percent of the U.S. students in elementary school do not read at a basic level. Thirty-two percent of college graduates also have failed to reach this basic level. This may be the most important bill that we pass regarding our children and their success in school, because what it does, finally and most importantly, is focus on the proven ways of teaching children how to read.

We know today that the latest scientific research shows that 60 to 70 percent of all children read any way you teach them, but the other children need a very systemic, phonics-based approach to reading if they are ever going to read and be good readers.

We furthermore know that science has shown us that children that do not read by the end of third grade will always have a bigger struggle in reaching that basic level. Their opportunity to be good readers is much more difficult if they do not learn to read by the end of third grade.

Reading opens doors and failure to read slams those doors shut. So what we need is to make sure that we use the kind of scientifically proven method to teach our children, one that has not been in our schools so often in the past. This phonics-based approach is what teachers will learn as a result of this funding. We will also give parents the opportunity to provide tutorial service for their children, their choice based on the most recommended types of tutoring and reading approach.

It also endorses family literacy, so we are giving our children an opportunity to go to schools that teach the right kind of reading and parents who can help those children in the same way. I support this bill.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that everybody has said repeatedly that reading is so important to our way of life, even the basics for reading to fill out an application for employment, or reading instructions for toys that we put together for our children. Yet I have seen in my lifetime so many people that have even graduated from high school that have been functionally illiterate. Anything that we can do to improve the ability for children to read at an early age and to go on to higher education and better themselves by

learning to read and read well is something that we have done that is worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we be careful when we say that we wish schools the way they were when we were kids. But we have to understand, schools must be much better than they were when we were children. Why? Because we are in the 21st century.

When I went to a two-room, eighth grade elementary school, most children did not go beyond eighth grade. They went on to work. Many were not very literate. They did not have to be. It was easy to get a job, it was easy to support a family. They did not have to be as literate as they must be today.

So what we have tried to do with this legislation is take the mandate from the budget agreement and see whether we could create something that would give teachers the opportunity to be the best reading teachers there are; to give parents an opportunity to be the child's first and most important teacher; to make sure children do not fail or get socially promoted in first grade.

Mr. Speaker, this is a small program to improve the existing program. We are not out there trying to create some magnificent program that will end all illiteracy in this country. We are trying to make all of our programs better programs so that every child has an opportunity for quality education. They must have it if we are going to succeed in a very competitive 21st century. We cannot have 40 percent of our children unable to read properly.

Reading readiness, reading skills. At one time one was literate if one could read at a sixth grade level. Now one is functionally illiterate if one cannot read and comprehend at the twelfth grade level. The only thing I want from the old schools is discipline. Everything else I want to be better.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2614, the Reading Excellence Act, which would authorize the Education Department to make grants to State reading and literacy partnerships.

Under the bill a State's reading and literacy partnership would consist of the Governor and chief State school officer, the chairmen and ranking members of each State legislative committee with jurisdiction over education, and a representative of a school district with at least one school in a title I school improvement program.

While the bill will allow State partnerships they must include in their applications an assurance that they would give subgrants only to those school districts that have family literacy programs based on Even Start, implement programs to assist kindergarten students who are not ready to make the transition to first grade, use supervised individuals to provide additional support before and after school and during the summer, and have a professional development program for the teaching of reading. Most important, the bill would require ap-

plications to describe how the state would send 95% of its funds to the local level.

The bill requires that State partnerships make subgrants on a competitive basis to school districts that have more than one school in a title I school improvement program.

This bill will be good for the children of Houston and good for the State of Texas because it will help to focus resources on the critical area of literacy and reading.

Reading is the most fundamental of skills that all children must master in order to do well in all subjects. I am a strong supporter of education, and feel that this measure will offer greater incentives to States and school districts to strengthen and develop reading programs. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2614, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2614.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LINE-ITEM VETO FIX

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2513), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and modify the provision of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to exempting active financing income from foreign personal holding company income and to provide for the non-recognition of gain on the sale of stock in agricultural processors to certain farmers' cooperatives, as amended, and table the bill, H.R. 2444.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2513

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION FOR ACTIVE FINANCING INCOME.

(a) EXEMPTION FROM FOREIGN PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY INCOME.—Section 954 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by subsection (d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) SPECIAL RULE FOR INCOME DERIVED IN THE ACTIVE CONDUCT OF INSURANCE BUSINESSES AND BANKING, FINANCING, OR SIMILAR BUSINESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (c)(1), foreign personal holding company income shall not include income which is—

“(A) derived in the active conduct by a controlled foreign corporation of a banking, financing, or similar business, but only if—

“(i) the corporation is predominantly engaged in the active conduct of such business, and

“(ii) such income is derived from transactions with customers located within the country under the laws of which the corporation is created or organized,

“(B) received from a person other than a related person (within the meaning of subsection (d)(3)) and derived from the investments made by a qualifying insurance company of its reserves or of 80 percent of its unearned premiums (as both are determined in the manner prescribed under paragraph (4)), or

“(C) received from a person other than a related person (within the meaning of subsection (d)(3)) and derived from investments made by a qualifying insurance company of an amount of its assets equal to—

“(i) in the case of property, casualty, or health insurance contracts, one-third of its premiums earned on such insurance contracts during the taxable year (as defined in section 832(b)(4)), and

“(ii) in the case of life insurance or annuity contracts, 10 percent of the reserves described in subparagraph (B) for such contracts.

“(2) **PREDOMINANTLY ENGAGED.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a controlled foreign corporation shall be deemed predominantly engaged in the active conduct of a banking, financing, or similar business only if—

“(A) more than 70 percent of its gross income is derived from such business from transactions with customers which are located within the country under the laws of which the corporation is created or organized, or

“(B) the corporation is—

“(i) engaged in the active conduct of a banking business and is an institution licensed to do business as a bank in the United States (or is any other corporation not so licensed which is specified by the Secretary in regulations), or

“(ii) engaged in the active conduct of a securities business and is registered as a securities broker or dealer under section 15(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or is registered as a Government securities broker or dealer under section 15C(a) of such Act (or is any other corporation not so registered which is specified by the Secretary in regulations).

“(3) **PRINCIPLES FOR DETERMINING INSURANCE INCOME.**—Except as provided by the Secretary, for purposes of paragraphs (1) (B) and (C)—

“(A) in the case of any contract which is a separate account-type contract (including any variable contract not meeting the requirements of section 817), income credited under such contract shall be allocable only to such contract, and

“(B) income not allocable under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated ratably among contracts not described in subparagraph (A).

“(4) **METHODS FOR DETERMINING UNEARNED PREMIUMS AND RESERVES.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)—

“(A) **PROPERTY AND CASUALTY CONTRACTS.**—The unearned premiums and reserves of a qualifying insurance company with respect to property, casualty, or health insurance contracts shall be determined using the same methods and interest rates which would be used if such company were subject to tax under subchapter L.

“(B) **LIFE INSURANCE AND ANNUITY CONTRACTS.**—The amount of the reserve of a qualifying insurance company for any life in-

surance or annuity contract shall be equal to the greater of—

“(i) the net surrender value of such contract (as defined in section 807(e)(1)(A)), or

“(ii) the reserve determined under paragraph (5).

“(C) **LIMITATION ON RESERVES.**—In no event shall the reserve determined under this paragraph for any contract as of any time exceed the amount which would be taken into account with respect to such contract as of such time in determining foreign statement reserves (less any catastrophe, deficiency, or similar reserves).

“(5) **AMOUNT OF RESERVE.**—The amount of the reserve determined under this paragraph with respect to any contract shall be determined in the same manner as it would be determined if the qualifying insurance company were subject to tax under subchapter L, except that in applying such subchapter—

“(A) the interest rate determined for the foreign country in which such company is created or organized and which, except as provided by the Secretary, is calculated in the same manner as the Federal mid-term rate under section 1274(d) shall be substituted for the applicable Federal interest rate,

“(B) the highest assumed interest rate permitted to be used in determining foreign statement reserves shall be substituted for the prevailing State assumed interest rate, and

“(C) tables for mortality and morbidity which reasonably reflect the current mortality and morbidity risks in the foreign country shall be substituted for the mortality and morbidity tables otherwise used for such subchapter.

“(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) **QUALIFYING INSURANCE COMPANY.**—The term ‘qualifying insurance company’ means any entity which—

“(i) is subject to regulation as an insurance company by the country under the laws of which the entity is created or organized,

“(ii) derives at least 50 percent of its net written premiums from the insurance or reinsurance of risks located within such country, and

“(iii) is engaged in the active conduct of an insurance business and would be subject to tax under subchapter L if it were a domestic corporation.

“(B) **LIFE INSURANCE OR ANNUITY CONTRACT.**—For purposes of this section and section 953, the determination of whether a contract issued by a controlled foreign corporation is a life insurance contract or an annuity contract shall be made without regard to sections 72(s), 101(f), 817(h), and 7702 if—

“(i) such contract is regulated as a life insurance or annuity contract by the country under the laws of which the corporation is created or organized, and

“(ii) no policyholder, insured, annuitant, or beneficiary with respect to the contract is a United States person.

“(C) **NONCANCELLABLE ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE CONTRACTS.**—A noncancellable accident and health insurance contract shall be treated for purposes of this subsection in the same manner as a life insurance contract except that paragraph (4)(B)(i) shall not apply.

“(D) **LOCATED.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The determination of where a customer is located shall be made under rules prescribed by the Secretary.

“(ii) **SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED BUSINESS UNITS.**—Gross income derived by a corporation’s qualified business unit (within the meaning of section 989(a)) from transactions with customers which are located in the country in which the qualified business unit both maintains its principal office and con-

ducts substantial business activity shall be treated as derived from transactions with customers which are located within the country under the laws of which the controlled foreign corporation is created or organized.

“(E) **CUSTOMER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘customer’ means, with respect to any controlled foreign corporation, any person which has a customer relationship with such corporation.

“(ii) **EXCEPTION FOR RELATED, ETC. PERSONS.**—A person who is a related person (as defined in subsection (d)(3)), an officer, a director, or an employee with respect to any controlled foreign corporation shall not be treated as a customer with respect to any transaction if a principal purpose of such transaction is to satisfy any requirement of this subsection.

“(7) **ANTI-ABUSE RULES.**—For purposes of applying this subsection and subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii), there shall be disregarded any item of income, gain, loss, or deduction with respect to any transaction or series of transactions one of the principal purposes of which is qualifying income or gain for the exclusion under this section, including—

“(A) any change in the method of computing reserves or any other transaction or series of transactions a principal purpose of which is the acceleration or deferral of any item in order to claim the benefits of such exclusion through the application of this subsection, and

“(B) organizing entities in order to satisfy any same country requirement under this subsection.

“(8) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.**—

“(A) **SECTION 901(k).**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of qualified taxes (as defined in section 901(k)(4)) to which paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 901(k) do not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of such section 901(k) shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to such qualified taxes as the amount of income from the active conduct of a securities business which is not subpart F income solely by reason of this subsection, subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii), and subsection (e)(2)(C) bears to the total income from the active conduct of a securities business by a controlled foreign corporation which is not subpart F income. The determination under the preceding sentence shall be made by treating all members of an affiliated group as 1 corporation. For purposes of this clause, the term ‘subpart F income’ has the meaning given such term by section 952(a) but determined without regard to section 952(c) and paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) of this section.

“(ii) **ELECTION NOT TO HAVE SUBSECTION AND CERTAIN OTHER PROVISIONS APPLY.**—Clause (i) shall not apply for any taxable year of a foreign corporation if such corporation (and all members of the affiliated group of which such corporation is a member) elect not to have this subsection, subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii), and subsection (e)(2)(C) apply for such taxable year.

“(B) **TREATMENT OF INCOME TO WHICH SECTION 953 APPLIES.**—Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall not apply to investment income allocable to contracts that insure related party risks or risks located in a foreign country other than the country in which the qualifying insurance company is created or organized.

“(9) **APPLICATION.**—This subsection, subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii), and subsection (e)(2)(C) shall apply only to the first full taxable year of a foreign corporation beginning after December 31, 1997, and before January 1, 1999, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable year of such foreign corporation ends.”

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR DEALERS.—Section 954(c)(2)(C) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR DEALERS.—Except as provided by regulations, in the case of a regular dealer in property (within the meaning of paragraph (1)(B)), forward contracts, option contracts, or similar financial instruments (including notional principal contracts and all instruments referenced to commodities), there shall not be taken into account in computing foreign personal holding income—

“(i) any item of income, gain, deduction, or loss (other than any item described in subparagraph (A), (E), or (G) of paragraph (1)) from any transaction (including hedging transactions) entered into in the ordinary course of such dealer’s trade or business as such a dealer, and

“(ii) if such dealer is a dealer in securities (within the meaning of section 475), any interest or dividend or equivalent amount described in subparagraph (E) or (G) of paragraph (1) from any transaction (including any hedging transaction or transaction described in section 956(c)(2)(J)) entered into in the ordinary course of such dealer’s trade or business as such a dealer in securities, but only if employees of the dealer which are located in the country under the laws of which the dealer is created or organized (or in the case of a qualified business unit described in section 989(a) which both maintains its principal office and conducts substantial business activity in a country, employees of such unit which are located in such country) materially participate in such transaction.”

(C) EXEMPTION FROM FOREIGN BASE COMPANY SERVICES INCOME.—Paragraph (2) of section 954(e) of such Code (as amended by subsection (d)) is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) a transaction by the controlled foreign corporation if the income from the transaction is not foreign personal holding company income by reason of subsection (h), or

“(ii) a transaction by the controlled foreign corporation if subsection (c)(2)(C)(ii) applies to such transaction.”

(d) REPEAL OF CANCELED PROVISIONS.—Section 1175 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, and the amendments made by such section, are hereby repealed, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if such section (and amendments) had never been enacted.

SEC. 2. NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN ON SALE OF STOCK TO CERTAIN FARMERS' COOPERATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nontaxable exchanges) is amended by inserting after section 1042 the following new section:

“SEC. 1042A. SALES OF STOCK TO CERTAIN FARMERS' COOPERATIVES.

“(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If—

“(1) the taxpayer elects the application of this section with respect to any sale of qualified agricultural processor stock,

“(2) the taxpayer purchases qualified replacement property within the replacement period, and

“(3) the requirements of subsection (c) are met with respect to such sale,

then the gain (if any) on such sale which would be recognized as long-term capital gain shall be recognized only to the extent that the amount realized on such sale exceeds the cost to the taxpayer of such qualified replacement property. The preceding sentence shall not apply to a sale by an eligible farmers’ cooperative.

“(b) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If subsection (a) applies to the sale of any stock by the taxpayer in a qualified agricultural processor, the aggregate amount of gain taken into account by the taxpayer under subsection (a) with respect to stock in such processor shall not exceed the amount of the limitation under paragraph (2) which is allocated to such sale by the eligible farmers’ cooperative.

“(2) ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated under this paragraph by any cooperative with respect to stock acquired by such cooperative during any taxable year of such cooperative shall not exceed \$75,000,000.

“(3) AGGREGATION RULES.—All eligible farmers’ cooperatives which are under common control (within the meaning of subsection (a) or (b) of section 52) shall be treated as 1 cooperative for purposes of paragraph (2), and the limitation under such paragraph shall be allocated among such cooperatives in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS TO QUALIFY FOR NONRECOGNITION.—A sale of qualified agricultural processor stock meets the requirements of this subsection if—

“(1) SALE TO ELIGIBLE FARMERS’ COOPERATIVE.—Such stock is sold to an eligible farmers’ cooperative.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN COOPERATIVES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a sale of such stock to an eligible farmers’ cooperative described in subparagraph (B), the processor purchased, during at least 3 of the 5 most recent taxable years of such processor ending on or before the date of the sale, more than one-half of the agricultural or horticultural products to be refined or processed by such processor from such cooperative or farmers who are members of such cooperative.

“(B) COOPERATIVES DESCRIBED.—A cooperative is described in this subparagraph with respect to any sale if, for any taxable year ending before the date of such sale—

“(i) such cooperative had gross receipts of more than \$1,000,000,000, or

“(ii) such cooperative sold more than a de minimis amount of specialty produce.

“(C) SPECIALTY PRODUCE.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term ‘specialty produce’ means any agricultural or horticultural product other than wheat, feed grains, oil seeds, cotton, rice, cattle, hogs, sheep, or dairy products.

“(D) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) GROSS RECEIPTS.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(i), rules similar to the rules of paragraph (2), and subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (3), of section 448(c) shall apply.

“(ii) PREDECESSOR.—Any reference in this paragraph to a cooperative or processor shall be treated as including a reference to any predecessor thereof.

“(3) COOPERATIVE MUST HOLD 100 PERCENT OF STOCK AFTER SALE.—The eligible farmers’ cooperative owns, immediately after the sale, all of the qualified agricultural processor stock of the corporation.

“(4) WRITTEN STATEMENT AND HOLDING PERIOD.—Requirements similar to the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1042(b) are met.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) QUALIFIED AGRICULTURAL PROCESSOR STOCK.—The term ‘qualified agricultural processor stock’ means stock (other than stock described in section 1504(a)(4)) issued by a qualified agricultural processor.

“(2) QUALIFIED AGRICULTURAL PROCESSOR.—The term ‘qualified agricultural processor’ means a domestic C corporation substantially all of the assets of which are used in the active conduct of the trade or business of

refining or processing agricultural or horticultural products in the United States.

“(3) ELIGIBLE FARMERS’ COOPERATIVE.—The term ‘eligible farmers’ cooperative’ means an organization to which part I of subchapter T applies and which is engaged in the marketing of agricultural or horticultural products.

“(4) REPLACEMENT PERIOD.—The term ‘replacement period’ means the period which begins 3 months before the date on which the sale of qualified agricultural processor stock occurs and which ends 12 months after the date of such sale.

“(5) QUALIFIED REPLACEMENT PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘qualified replacement property’ has the meaning given such term by section 1042(c)(4).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The term ‘qualified replacement property’ shall not include any security issued by the taxpayer or by any corporation controlled by the taxpayer immediately after the purchase. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘control’ has the meaning given such term by section 304(c) (determined by substituting ‘10 percent’ for ‘50 percent’ each place it appears in paragraph (1) thereof).

“(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 1042(c), subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 1042, section 1016(a)(22), and section 1223(13) shall apply for purposes of this section.

“(2) CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOT TO APPLY.—

“(A) RECOGNITION ON COMPLETE LIQUIDATION.—Section 332 shall not apply to the liquidation into the cooperative or any related person of a qualified agricultural processor if the cooperative or related person acquired the stock in such processor in a sale to which subsection (a) applied.

“(B) DEEMED SALE ELECTION NOT AVAILABLE.—No election may be made under section 338(h)(10) with respect to a sale to which subsection (a) applies.

“(f) RECAPTURE OF TAX BENEFIT WHERE LACK OF CONTINUITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If there is a recapture event during any taxable year with respect to any sale to an eligible farmers’ cooperative to which this section applied, such cooperative’s tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) the recapture percentage of the amount allocated under subsection (b) to such sale, multiplied by

“(B) the highest rate of tax imposed by section 11 for such taxable year.

“(2) RECAPTURE EVENT.—For purposes of this subsection, a recapture event shall be treated as occurring in any taxable year if—

“(A) any portion of such taxable year is within the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the eligible farmers’ cooperative acquired stock in a qualified agricultural processor in a sale to which this section applied and, as of the close of such portion, there is a decrease in the direct or indirect percentage ownership of such stock held by such cooperative which was not previously taken into account under this subsection, or

“(B) such taxable year is one of the first 5 taxable years ending after the date of such sale and is the third of such taxable years during which one-half or less of the agricultural or horticultural products refined or processed by the qualified agricultural processor are purchased from the eligible farmers’ cooperative or farmers who are members of such cooperative.

“(3) RECAPTURE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘recapture percentage’ means—

“(A) in the case of a recapture event described in paragraph (2)(A), the percentage equal to a fraction—

“(i) the numerator of which is the percentage decrease described in paragraph (2)(A), and

“(ii) the denominator of which is the percentage which the qualified agricultural processor stock acquired by the cooperative in a sale to which this section applied bears to all qualified agricultural processor stock in the processor, and

“(B) in the case of a recapture event described in paragraph (2)(B), 100 percent.

In no event shall the recapture percentage for any taxable year exceed 100 percent minus the sum of the recapture percentages for all prior taxable years.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS TO PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—The purchase requirement of paragraph (2)(B) shall be treated as met for any taxable year if the Secretary determines that such requirement was not met due to 1 or more of the following: flood, drought, or other weather-related conditions, environmental contamination, disease, fire, or other similar extenuating circumstances prescribed by the Secretary.

“(g) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 1042.—No election may be made under this section with respect to any sale if an election is made under section 1042 with respect to such sale.

“(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are appropriate to carry out this section, including regulations which treat 2 or more sales which are part of the same transaction as 1 sale.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 26(b) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (P), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (Q) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(R) section 1042A(f) (relating to recapture of tax benefit where lack of continuity in certain agricultural processors).”

(2) The table of sections for part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1042 the following new item:

“Sec. 1042A. Sales of stock to certain farmers' cooperatives.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales after December 31, 1997.

SEC. 3. DISPOSAL OF PALLADIUM AND PLATINUM IN NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE.

(a) DISPOSAL REQUIRED.—(1) During fiscal year 1998, the President shall dispose of not more than 130,000 troy ounces of palladium and not more than 20,000 troy ounces of platinum contained in the National Defense Stockpile so as to result in receipts to the United States in an amount equal to \$17,000,000 during fiscal year 1998.

(2) During each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2002, the President shall dispose of not more than 60,000 troy ounces of palladium contained in the National Defense Stockpile so as to result in receipts to the United States in an amount equal to \$4,000,000 during each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2002.

(b) DEPOSIT OF RECEIPTS.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h), funds received as a result of the disposal of materials under subsection (a) shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER DISPOSAL AUTHORITY.—The disposal authority provided in subsection (a) is new disposal authority and is in addition to, and shall not affect, any

other disposal authority provided by law regarding palladium or platinum contained in the National Defense Stockpile.

(d) TERMINATION OF DISPOSAL AUTHORITY.—The disposal authority provided in subsection (a) shall terminate with regard to a fiscal year specified in such subsection on the date on which the total amount of receipts to the United States during that fiscal year from the disposal of materials under such subsection equals the amount specified in such subsection for that fiscal year.

(e) DEFINITION.—The term “National Defense Stockpile” means the stockpile provided for in section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98c).

SEC. 4. RECOVERY OF COSTS OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORITIES.—Section 904 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4084) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “and” after “employees,”, and

(B) by inserting before the period “, and (for care provided abroad) such other persons as are designated by the Secretary of State”;

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “, subject to subsections (g) through (i)” before “the Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(g)(1)(A) In the case of a covered beneficiary who is provided health care under this section and who is enrolled in a covered health benefits plan of a third-party payer, the United States shall have the right to collect from the third-party payer a reasonable charge amount for the care to the extent that the payment would be made under such plan for such care under the conditions specified in paragraph (2) if a claim were submitted by or on behalf of the covered beneficiary.

“(B) Such a covered beneficiary is not required to pay any deductible, copayment, or other cost-sharing under the covered health benefits plan or under this section for health care provided under this section.

“(2) With respect to health care provided under this section to a covered beneficiary, for purposes of carrying out paragraph (1)—

“(A) the reasonable charge amount (as defined in paragraph (9)(C)) shall be treated by the third-party payer as the payment basis otherwise allowable for the care under the plan;

“(B) under regulations, if the covered health benefits plan restricts or differentiates in benefit payments based on whether a provider of health care has a participation agreement with the third-party payer, the Secretary shall be treated as having such an agreement as results in the highest level of payment under this subsection;

“(C) no provision of the health benefit plan having the effect of excluding from coverage or limiting payment of charges for certain care shall operate to prevent collection under subsection (a), including (but not limited to) any provision that limits coverage or payment on the basis that—

“(i) the care was provided outside the United States,

“(ii) the care was provided by a governmental entity,

“(iii) the covered beneficiary (or any other person) has no obligation to pay for the care,

“(iv) the provider of the care is not licensed to provide the care in the United States or other location,

“(v) a condition of coverage relating to utilization review, prior authorization, or similar utilization control has not been met, or

“(vi) in the case that drugs were provided, the provision of the drugs for any indicated purpose has not been approved by the Fed-

eral Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Administration;

“(D) if the covered health benefits plan contains a requirement for payment of a deductible, copayment, or similar cost-sharing by the beneficiary—

“(i) the beneficiary's not having paid such cost-sharing with respect to the care shall not preclude collection under this section, and

“(ii) the amount the United States may collect under this section shall be reduced by application of the appropriate cost-sharing;

“(E) amounts that would be payable by the third-party payer under this section but for the application of a deductible under subparagraph (D)(ii) shall be counted towards such deductible notwithstanding that under paragraph (1)(B) the individual is not charged for the care and did not pay an amount towards such care; and

“(F) the Secretary may apply such other provisions as may be appropriate to carry out this section in an equitable manner.

“(3) In exercising authority under paragraph (1)—

“(A) the United States shall be subrogated to any right or claim that the covered beneficiary may have against a third-party payer;

“(B) the United States may institute and prosecute legal proceedings against a third-party payer to enforce a right of the United States under this section; and

“(C) the Secretary may compromise, settle, or waive a claim of the United States under this section.

“(4) No law of any State, or of any political subdivision of a State, shall operate to prevent or hinder collection by the United States under this section.

“(5) If collection is sought from a third-party payer for health care furnished a covered beneficiary under this section, under regulations medical records of the beneficiary shall be made available for inspection and review by representatives of the third-party payer for the sole purpose of permitting the third-party payer to verify, consistent with this subsection that—

“(A) the care for which recovery or collection is sought were furnished to the beneficiary; and

“(B) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provision of such care to the beneficiary meets criteria generally applicable under the covered health benefits plan.

“(6) The Secretary shall establish (and periodically update) a schedule of reasonable charge amounts for health care provided under this section. The amount under such schedule for health care shall be based on charges or fee schedule amounts recognized by third-party payers under covered health benefits plans for payment purposes for similar health care services furnished in the Metropolitan Washington, District of Columbia, area.

“(7) The Secretary shall establish a procedure under which a covered beneficiary may elect to have subsection (h) apply instead of this subsection with respect to some or all health care provided to the beneficiary under this section.

“(8) Amounts collected under this subsection, under subsection (h), or under any authority referred to in subsection (i), from a third-party payer or from any other payer shall be deposited in the Treasury as a miscellaneous offsetting receipt.

“(9) For purposes of this section:

“(A) The term ‘covered beneficiary’ means a member or employee (or family member of such a member or employee) described in subsection (a) who is enrolled under a covered health benefits plan.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the term ‘covered health benefits plan’ means a health

benefits plan offered under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

"(ii) Such term does not include such a health benefits plan (such as a plan of a staff-model health maintenance organization) as the Secretary determines pursuant to regulations to be structured in a manner that impedes the application of this subsection to individuals enrolled under the plan. To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall seek to disseminate to members of the Service and designated employees described in subsection (a) who are eligible to receive health care under this section the names of plans excluded under this clause.

"(C) The term 'reasonable charge amount' means, with respect to health care provided under this section, the amount for such care specified in the schedule established under paragraph (6).

"(D) The term 'third-party payer' means an entity that offers a covered health benefits plan.

"(h)(1) In the case of an individual who—

"(A) receives health care pursuant to this section; and

"(B)(i) is not a covered beneficiary (including by virtue of enrollment only in a health benefits plan excluded under subsection (g)(9)(B)(ii)), or

"(ii) is such a covered beneficiary and has made an election described in subsection (g)(7) with respect to such care, the Secretary is authorized to collect from the individual the full reasonable charge amount for such care.

"(2) The United States shall have the same rights against such individuals with respect to collection of such amounts as the United States has with respect to collection of amounts against a third-party payer under subsection (g), except that the rights under this subsection shall be exercised without regard to any rules for deductibles, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing.

"(i) Subsections (g) and (h) shall apply to reimbursement for the cost of hospitalization and related outpatient expenses paid for under subsection (d) only to the extent provided in regulations. Nothing in this subsection, or subsections (g) and (h), shall be construed as limiting any authority the Secretary otherwise has with respect to obtaining reimbursement for the payments made under subsection (d)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to items and services provided on and after January 1, 1998.

(2) In order to carry out such amendments in a timely manner, the Secretary of State is authorized to issue interim, final regulations that take effect pending notice and opportunity for public comment.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$2,000,000 to offset the costs of carrying out the amendments made by this section. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2513, which would restore and modify the two tax provisions in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 that was subject to a Presidential line-item veto earlier this year.

The first provision applies to the income earned abroad by companies en-

gaged in providing financial services, and the second one that was line item vetoed applies to the sale of former cooperatives of stock in a corporation that owns agricultural processing assets.

President Clinton, by virtue of his line item power, canceled these two provisions, stating several objections. In short, the committee, working with the administration, with groups who were affected on the outside, and with Members who thought these were worthy projects, have now corrected the concerns of the administration, and as modified and presented here today, the two incentives are supported by the administration and by all known interested parties.

□ 1645

It should also be noted that in revising the two provisions, they have been narrowed, it will be significantly reducing their revenue cost.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we believe that in the changes that were made, since H.R. 2513 actually saves money, there is no need to have a revenue or a spending offset. Suffice it to say this is not the time, nor do we have the time, to argue the way in which we determined budgetary matters. So what we have done is made sure that there are some spending offsets which are available.

We are indebted to the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has graciously provided in the bill two offsets, as I understand them. One is the disposal of some palladium and platinum in the national defense stockpile, and second, the recovery of costs of health care services for foreign service personnel. That is about the limit of my knowledge of these offsets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the Committee on the Budget, to explain these offsets in some detail.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. The Joint Tax Committee estimates that the enactment of these two provisions will reduce Federal receipts by \$72 million between 1998 through 2002. The two tax procedures are paid for by two other offsets as required by pay-go procedures.

The first offset requires the U.S. Embassies to recover costs they incur by providing medical care to Federal employees overseas from the employee's health insurance provider when the employee is a participant in the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. This offset is going to provide \$40 million, according to CBO.

The second offset would sell 33 million dollars' worth of commodities, specifically platinum and palladium, that have been identified by the Department of Defense as being in excess to the national security. This would be the second amount and would complete the amount of money necessary to do this which is required under the cur-

rent legislation relating to the line-item veto.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very appreciative to be talking about this bill today. It is a bill which I have worked for, for a number of years. In fact, my interest in it has dated back to 1986, when we did the large tax reform. This bill contains a modified version of the following two tax provisions that were contained in the recently enacted Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. They were canceled by the President under his line-item veto.

The first one was a temporary exemption under subpart F of financial services income. The second part, and these two pieces are linked together in the override, is a nonrecognition of gain on certain sales of processing facilities to farmers' cooperatives.

The bill is bipartisan, and it is a compromise that addresses the concerns of the President of the United States in his line-item veto. The administration does not object to the provisions contained in the bill before us today.

I have been a supporter of this provision of the bill that modifies subpart F for active financial services income for the following reasons:

U.S. companies with active businesses overseas generally are not required to pay tax on the income from these businesses until the income is repatriated back to the United States. This treatment is called deferral.

The only active businesses not receiving the benefits of deferral are financial services businesses, because they derive much of their income in the form of dividends, interest, and capital gains that are subject to concurrent taxation under subpart F.

Prior to 1986, active financial service businesses were eligible for the benefits of deferral. The 1986 Tax Reform Act denied the benefits of deferral to active financial service businesses out of concern that these businesses could utilize tax havens to avoid all taxation. The moneys in question had to stay within the countries where the business was being done.

The bill reinstates pre-1986 treatment for financial businesses, but it contains many restrictions to limit the potential abuses that led to the enactment of the 1986 restrictions. When the President and his people at the White House looked at this bill, they were afraid that the same kind of abuses would happen as were thought to happen before 1986. Interestingly enough, these things did not happen, but the same concerns were there when they were looking at the budget, and therefore that was the reason for the override.

The floor consideration of this bill has been delayed because of concerns by the Committee on the Budget that it was not paid for as required under the pay-go rules, as the gentleman

from California [Mr. THOMAS] has suggested and the Member from the Committee on the Budget has suggested do not, in fact, exist.

The bill now contains two non-controversial spending cuts to pay for the tax provisions. I do not object to the financing mechanism contained in the bill, but I do believe that the waiver of the pay-go requirement contained in the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means was the better way to go. But to be on the safe said, they do have two places to pay for it here today, and on which the Member of the Committee on the Budget has said that these are good ways to have it happen.

One of these two provisions, as I said, would provide fair and, I have not used this word in a long time, but a level playing field for our companies who are doing business in foreign countries. Generally U.S. companies with active businesses overseas are allowed to defer U.S. tax on the income from their businesses until that income comes back to the United States.

Unfortunately, U.S. financial service companies, like a large number of insurance companies headquartered in my district of Connecticut, and the many securities dealers represented from all over these States, as well as our own banking industry, have not been eligible to benefit from the general rules because they derive much of their income, as I said, from dividends, interest, and capital gains.

Even though many foreign countries exempt income earned abroad from tax altogether, and our companies are forced to compete with these companies that are not taxed, they not only are not taxed, many of these companies are subsidized. I have been interested in the whole situation of us being able to compete abroad in these financial industries of banking, insurance, securities.

Over the years I have seen things develop. We are making some progress. I remember 1 year going to talk about trade in a country, and it was a very lovely meeting, and everybody was being very polite to each other in a diplomatic manner. We were told, do not worry about it, of course we want your insurance companies to come in and compete. Of course we know you have some of the best products. Do not think too much about it, we want to open up our business to you.

That night I went back to the hotel where we were staying, not having enough reading material with me, there was a copy of the Constitution of that country in the hotel room, and I happened to take the time to read it. Now this was called really bored, but I did this. And in the Constitution of that country, I looked, and I could not believe my eyes, having heard this discussion during the meeting during the day. I read right there, anybody who tries to sell insurance from another country and not from this country will be criminally prosecuted.

So we have come a long way in our financial services in competition. Of course, as now we are in the midst of fast-track debate and all the things that many of us are concerned about on both sides of the question, one thing we have to say, not only that we can be proud of our financial services, not only can we be proud of our regulation of our securities, of the fine products we sell in insurance, of our banking that is renowned around the world for its regulation, honesty, and good business practices, but we can say if we are over there competing, there is no question about the environment or there is no question about not paying properly, because you have to be well-educated to do these services in the proper fashion that we do it. Really, this is an area that we should be very proud of, that we can compete in internationally.

Mr. Speaker, I hope soon we can find a permanent solution to this financial service industry so we can compete more effectively overseas. But in the meantime I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is an issue that has been before us for a number of years. It is an issue that a number of us have worked on.

Each time when we try to get a little ways, then we find something else that is in our way. I think what has happened in the presentation of this bill today, coming up in the fashion that it has, is that we have all parties having studied this very carefully, really sanitized it, then having it go to the President and to the White House and to the administration, and once again being looked at in a very proper and wonderful fashion, in a bipartisan fashion, and we are here today to finally say to our financial industries, we do not want to handicap you. We do not want to have you deal abroad with one hand tied behind your back. We are proud of our financial industries, and we are very delighted today that we have this bill on the floor before us.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege, actually, to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF], a freshman on the Committee on Ways and Means, who has now run the virtual gamut of emotions, as he was the original author of the provision which was line-item vetoed by the President, an historical point he probably does not wish to remember, and then worked diligently and, quite frankly, brilliantly to produce the compromise that now stands before us, moving from triumph to tragedy and soon to triumph.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I thank him for that reminder of how it is we came to this point.

In fact, if the gentleman will indulge me as a point of personal privilege, when I was sworn in on this floor on January 7, my parents were here, of course, and proud Papa remarked to one of the newspaper people that his

son was going to be in the history books someday.

And I had to call him in that first week in August and say, Dad, you were right, your prophecy has come true. I have made it in the history books. I am the first ever victim of the line item veto. I just thought history would taste a little sweeter than this.

We have come full circle, hopefully. I certainly support H.R. 2513, the new and improved version. I know that there are colleagues of mine that will be speaking to the subpart F, and in support. So what I want to do is focus primarily on the farmer cooperative provision.

I would be remiss unless I provided kudos to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who coauthored this provision with me. I am happy to have worked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] in trying to resurrect this provision. I think we have a good provision.

As the gentleman pointed out, this was part of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. We made it through the House, through the Senate, back through conference, and ultimately to the President's desk, and when the President actually vetoed this provision, he said that it was a well-intentioned provision, but that it was overbroad, that it was vague, and looked forward to working with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and myself in trying to craft a measure that could pass muster. So we have been able to do that. We stayed the course, and I think again have a good bill.

Let me briefly talk about the goal of the legislation as far as it relates to the farmer co-ops. With the enactment of the farm bill in the last Congress, and as we move toward a balanced budget, toward the year 2002, Federal spending for agriculture programs will be unable to stay at the same level that they have been in decades past.

Having come from a family farm, I think I know firsthand that if our Nation's farmers and our rural communities are to remain economically viable, if they are going to remain self-reliant, then we in Congress have a duty to reach out to them as we can to help them remain self-sufficient.

I do not think there is any controversy that a company, a U.S. company, is more profitable as it vertically integrates. The same is true in agriculture. It is widely acknowledged that the most profitable sector of agriculture is in the refining and processing of agriculture products.

If Members will allow me to demonstrate, this is a chart, a blowup that we used back in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District, but it is applicable to all American farmers. But just a couple of quick examples.

In the State of Missouri, from 1 acre of corn you can generally count on about 135 bushels of corn from that single acre. If you take that corn to the grain elevator, the average price you will receive is about \$405 from that single acre of corn.

But if you take that raw product of corn and you add value to it, if you turn corn into ethanol, which is a corn-based fuel, there are about 378 gallons of ethanol and ethanol by-products that come forth from the processing of the corn from 1 acre, which is about \$800, which is about twice the amount, as you add value to the corn.

Obviously, corn going into cereal, over 6,700 boxes of corn flakes come from 1 acre of corn, with a profit margin of about \$13,000. The same thing is true with soybeans. An acre of soybeans in Missouri will generally yield about 40 bushels per acre; again, about \$350 per bushel. But if you take that acre of soybeans and turn it into vegetable oil or to soybean meal or to soy diesel or to any other value-added product, you are allowing farmers to reap the profits and the rewards of the value-added side of the processing of this raw product.

□ 1700

Now, some of my colleagues talk about trying to complicate the Tax Code, and I want to briefly talk to those individuals, because what we want to do is try to make sure we have a fairer code.

Why do we need this particular provision? Right now, if we were a corporation and we wanted to acquire a processing facility owned by another corporation, we would look to the Internal Revenue code, section 368. And assuming that we were selling this processing plant at \$100 million, the amount of capital gains would be approximately \$35 million. Well, under section 368, that amount of gain can be deferred. That amount of gain would be deferred.

Similarly, an ESOP provision, employee stock ownership plan; section 1042 of the code would allow a deferral of that \$35 million in gains, so that there would be no gain. A section of the code is available for those that participate in employee stock ownership plans, such that they would not have any gain, that the gain would be deferred. Even foreign corporations have a section of the code whereby they get some preferential treatment.

And then we have farmer cooperatives. What we are trying to do is allow farmers who belong to farmer cooperatives to participate on the same level playing field. And right now they are not there. So what we have done through this section of the code is to allow the seller of a processing facility to defer that gain as long as that gain is reinvested as long as that gain is not reinvested in other assets that are owned by the seller.

We want to make sure, and the White House told us that they want to the make sure, that this provision would not be used for sham transactions or the avoidance of tax liability. That was not the intent of the legislation. So we have cracked down and tightened up, and we put restrictions in to accomplish the goal, and that is to help those farmers who participate and our mem-

bers of farmer cooperatives to allow them to reap the benefits of value-added agriculture.

Again, we took the President up on his offer to work with the White House. And I commend those with Treasury and the White House. I also, again, commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for his steadfastness in working out this provision. I think it is a good bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2513.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for yielding me the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I once again congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF].

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]. My colleague has, of course, worked very hard with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] on this bill, and we are all pleased at the outcome.

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] for yielding me the time and appreciate her efforts and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], who have worked very hard to bring this legislation to the point in which we have it today.

I, too, commend my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] for his tenacity on the Committee on Ways and Means, which had the jurisdiction over this, what started out to be non-controversial but got to be somewhat controversial.

When President Clinton announced his decision to veto the provision providing a tax deferral to sales of agricultural processing facilities to farmer cooperatives, I was extremely disappointed. But at the same time, he indicated a willingness to continue to work for legislation to help farmer cooperatives become vertically integrated.

I continue to believe that the original provision was effectively structured and that the veto was based on misinformation and a misunderstanding of the challenges facing farmers in the current world market. I do not believe for a moment that the original provision was a narrow tax benefit that should have been subject to the line item veto, and I believe the fact that we are here today indicates that there is now a general consensus of all that that was true.

I want to make it clear that this legislation before us is not my preferred position or my preferred option. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] and I agreed, though, that this compromised language because it was the only way to enact the provision after the veto was used on the

original language which was included in the Taxpayer Relief Act.

The compromise legislation which is before us does not include all the improvements I would have liked or Mr. HULSHOF would have liked and falls short of our original legislation. I am concerned that it places several restrictions on sales of agricultural processing facilities to farmer cooperatives that do not apply to transactions with corporate agribusinesses. These restrictions also continue to leave cooperatives at a competitive disadvantage against corporate agribusinesses.

However, as I have said, we were forced to add these restrictions to go after the administration's and others' objections to the original legislation. These reservations notwithstanding, I am very pleased that this compromise offers significant opportunities over current law for cooperatives comprised of individual family farmers to compete with corporate agriculture in the ever growing world marketplace. In that regard, I believe that a good deal. The original intent of the legislation has now been restored.

It is important for all of us in this body and for others to remember that even the largest cooperatives are comprised of thousands of small and midsized farmers who have come together to farm these cooperatives. In an effort to be competitive with the phaseout of Federal farm programs, it is imperative that farmers develop new strategies for remaining financially viable. Strengthening cooperatives grants individual farmers the opportunity to increase their income, provide better risk management, capitalize on new market opportunities, and compete more effectively in a changing global economy.

While not as thorough as our original legislation, this compromise begins the process of leveling the playing field by giving farmers and their cooperatives tax treatments similar to that for other types of corporate business, employee stock ownership plans, and worker cooperatives, when it comes to the purchase of processing and refining facilities.

I am pleased that the administration has moved from the original line-item veto to a position of greater understanding for the needs of small farmers and their cooperatives. We have a victory in compromise. Farmers will gain admission into markets they were excluded from absent this agreement. It is not as sweet a victory as we had hoped, but it is a testament to our democratic government which reinforces balance and compromise.

I have appreciated the support and advice and counsel of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which has endorsed this compromise as a significant improvement over current law. Based on the advice of the National Council and other agricultural groups who have concluded that half a loaf offered by this bill is better than no loaf at all, I intend to vote for this bill and

continue to work toward greater equity for family farmers and their co-operatives and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], on his comments. We began our legislative careers together. We were both Members of the 96th Congress and shared Committee on Agriculture seats together. I believe his analysis is absolutely correct.

My hope is that the process that produced this compromise also created a learning curve so that the need to be as innovative as possible in a market that has removed subsidies need not be hindered by the kind of activity that was engaged in by this administration and, indeed, any administration who now has the ability to go in and specifically make changes. That is a significant new power. I hope they understand it takes significant new knowledge and, hopefully, extensive consultation as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for the other portion of this combined bill dealing with financial services in companies that have income earned abroad.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in strong support of H.R. 2513. First let me begin my remarks just by commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and his staff for their tireless efforts to resolve the challenges that we faced with this first ever line-item veto of a tax provision.

I also want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that are members of this committee for their bipartisan effort to make this a successful effort, as well, because as my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], says, this is a victory. It is a victory for agriculture. It is a victory for the financial sector, and it is also an effort to bring about some tax fairness for agriculture and for the financial services sector.

Particularly, I also want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF], in his freshman year, who has shown his tenacity and also his ability as a first-term legislator to be able to get his job done. I know he serves as president of the freshman class. And maybe he should be freshman legislator of the year for what he achieved and for what is happening today, because my colleague has done a terrific job, working in a bipartisan way, to get the job done and helping bring this legislation to the floor.

I also know the portion of legislation that he and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] have worked tirelessly to move forward is important to Illinois agriculture as well as agriculture throughout the country.

It is my understanding that portion of the legislation will benefit 4,000 co-operatives throughout the country, benefiting 2 million farmer owners of these 4,000 co-operatives. We know that when we add value-added to agriculture, that creates jobs not just on the farm but in town as well. And that is an important piece of legislation.

I would like to speak briefly to the other half of this legislation, an issue that is important to Chicago and important to the Chicago south suburbs, because it addresses the taxation of the financial services sector, insurance, securities, and banking.

If we look, as we now recognize, we are in a global economy, we looked at how our institutions here in the United States are able to compete overseas, we have seen some of the challenges that we have been facing. If we look at banks alone 20 years ago, there were many American institutions in the top 20 institutions in the world. Today we are lucky to have one American bank in the top 20 in assets worldwide.

This legislation is so very, very important. And I have enjoyed working with my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], who has been a real leader on this issue over the years, and I have enjoyed working with her in a bipartisan way to bring about tax fairness and an issue of treating our financial services sector the same way we do others.

What this legislation does is, it puts financial services on parity with other sectors of our economy, puts financial services at parity when it comes to tax treatment with manufacturing, for example, and will allow us to create more jobs here at home while our financial services sector sells services overseas. That is what this is all about, creating jobs in Illinois and throughout this country as we work to give our financial services sector a better way of competing by bringing them to parity with our manufacturing sector as well.

Most importantly, though, is I want to point out that this has been a bipartisan effort. It has been an effort where Republicans and Democrats have worked together, where the administration has worked with the Congress. We have been able to address all concerns, and we produced a good bill, a bipartisan bill, a bill that helps agriculture, that creates jobs in towns and rural communities, but also gives the same advantages to compete overseas that our manufacturers have to our financial services sector as well. And that is what it is all about, creating jobs here at home as we sell products and services overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak to this bill. I do ask for bipartisan support for H.R. 2513.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2513. I commend

Chairman ARCHER of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. RANGEL, for bringing this important measure to the floor today. This bill would promote the international competitiveness of the U.S. financial services industry by conforming its tax treatment to that of all other U.S. industries, and even more significantly to that of foreign competitors operating throughout the world.

Title I of this measure is intended to replace the provision of the Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997 vetoed by the President on August 11 that was designed to change the antideferral rules of subpart F of the Internal Code that discriminates against the U.S. financial services industry by requiring current taxation of active financing income by foreign affiliates of U.S. banks, securities firms, and insurance and finance companies. I am pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means has been able to bring some rationality to the international taxation of U.S. financial service firms. Financial service companies are real businesses that deserve a fair international tax regime every bit as much as U.S. manufacturers. This bill begins the process of treating the two equally.

This bill is just a 1-year solution, but I hope it will form the basis of a permanent resolution of these issues. In order to pass a bill in such a short time period, Treasury had to restrict some classes of income so that the bill would not be susceptible to abuse. I hope that in the year to come the Treasury will study international operations of financial services firms and review some of the provisions that were excluded from this bill.

Finally, I am concerned by the Treasury's insistence that securities firms and banks forfeit some of their foreign tax credits in order to qualify for this new income-deferral provision. Foreign tax credits and income deferral have always coexisted because each serves a different purpose.

I believe that an effective foreign tax credit system is the U.S. industry's defense against international double taxation. I believe that foreign income taxes incurred in the conduct of an active business abroad should be credited in the United States. As we work towards a permanent income-deferral provision for financial services firms, I urge the Treasury to recognize the dealer exception from section 901(k) as a necessary and appropriate part of our tax system.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2531. The enactment of this measure will move us toward the goal of eliminating the inequitable treatment of the financial services industry under current laws and enhance the ability of a vital sector of our economy to compete in the global marketplace.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2513, which will provide farmer cooperatives with a tool to help them compete in the industrializing world of agriculture.

Cooperatives play a vital role in helping farmers market and process their crops and livestock and in securing farm supplies and other services at reasonable costs. The cooperative way of doing business in rural America simply makes sense.

North Dakota has a long history with co-operatives, reaching back to the early part of this century. In the past 5 years, farmers and communities have worked together to create 20 new farmer cooperatives in North Dakota.

Last year, Congress decided to eliminate the farm program which will leave farmers without a mechanism to recoup losses when the growing season is poor. One of the self-help mechanisms available to assist farmers in maintaining and increasing their incomes in farming is through the development and success of farmer cooperatives.

The success of agriculture ebbs and flows according to many circumstances outside the control of farmers. For instance, weather, disease, global market prices, and the economy all influence a producer's decisions. However, even with these influences on agriculture, the quality of the producer's goods increase and prices for consumers generally stay the same. Cooperatives benefit the farming community by allowing members to amass capital and maximize economic returns by enhancing the value of what farmers produce.

Farmers need bargaining tools in order to regain some influence over the prices they receive. With market concentration increasing, agricultural producers are finding fewer and fewer buyers for their products. Many farmers can only sell their product to a single processing company, and are forced to accept the price the company offers them. With empowered bargaining or vertical integration, farmers would have a greater opportunity to prosper and to share in the end-use profits their goods sometimes bring to others.

H.R. 2513 will provide for the nonrecognition of gain on the sale of stock in agricultural processors to eligible farmers' cooperatives. This provision will have the effect of encouraging agricultural processing facilities to work cooperatively with farmer cooperatives to maximize the work and profits of producers. The price paid to farmers for farm commodities represents less than 25 percent of the cost of the final product purchased by the consumer. It is imperative for the American farmer to increase his ownership stake in processing and refining in order to survive in an increasingly competitive market. Allowing farmers to become vertically integrated in their products will enable them to better adjust to fluctuations in commodity prices.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to express my support for H.R. 2513, legislation containing two important tax provisions, versions of which were contained in the landmark Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. The provisions in question were line item vetoed by President Clinton on August 11, and today, we are endeavoring to pass slightly modified versions of the original proposals.

One provision of the bill relates to the sale of stock of a corporation that owns a processing facility of any cooperative which is engaged in marketing agriculture or horticultural products. This matter is of great concern and interest to the farm community in this country and it is hoped this version of the proposal can now be enacted.

The other item in this legislation, and the provision to which I would like to devote the bulk of my remarks, relates to foreign affiliates of U.S. financial services companies. Under the language contained in H.R. 2513, these affiliates including banks, securities firms, and insurance and finance companies would not be taxed by the United States on their active trade or business income until that income is repatriated to the U.S. parent company or shareholders. In other words, this bill would equalize the treatment of income earned by

U.S.-based financial services companies operating abroad with the active income earned by most other U.S.-based companies operating in international markets. As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, even more important to me is the fact that the bill will level the playing field for the U.S. financial services industry vis a vis their foreign competitors.

As one of the Members who worked to include this provision in the Taxpayer Relief Act, I was disappointed with the President's line item veto. Therefore, I very much would like to make progress in this effort to remove a competitive obstacle imposed by our international tax rules on the overseas operations of U.S. financial services firms. Language in H.R. 2513 is intended to replace the vetoed provision of the Taxpayers Relief Act that was designed to reform the antideferral rules of subpart F of the Internal Revenue Code. In vetoing this measure, the President stated that the "primary purpose of the provision was proper," but the manner in which it was written would have left room for abuses.

Although I disagree with the decision of the President to veto this important provision, I am pleased he recognized that reform of the antideferral rules of subpart F represents sound and prudent tax policy. Subsequent to the veto, the financial services firms affected by this bill have worked intensely and closely with the Treasury and the Committee on Ways and Means to address the concerns raised, and I applaud the cooperative effort to come up with an interim solution.

However, I must express my disappointment and concern that the bill, at the Treasury's insistence, unjustly singles our securities dealers. As currently drafted H.R. 2513 will force securities dealers to forfeit tax credits on foreign withholding taxes to which they are entitled under current law in order to obtain the benefits granted to other sectors of the financial services industry. These foreign tax credits are crucial to the role U.S. securities firms and banks play as global equities dealers, without which such dealers will not be able to remain competitive overseas.

When we adopted section 901(k) of the code in 1997, we did so to forestall abusive trafficking in credits for foreign withholding taxes. We excluded some securities dealers from section 901(k) because those dealers, in the legitimate, ordinary course of their businesses, would almost by necessity run afoul of the simple rules for identifying transactions with trafficking potential. At the same time, we gave the Treasury authority to deal with any abuses by dealers. I have not heard of any evidence that Treasury has in fact identified any problems with section 901(k) to date. Therefore, I frankly must conclude that Treasury's insistence on this trade-off in the current bill reflects an ulterior motive to overturn the dealer exception in section 901(k), although we recently approved that exception by enacting it.

Foreign tax credits and tax deferral for certain active overseas income have coexisted and should continue to do so, because each serves a different purpose. Foreign tax credits provide essential protection against double taxation of overseas income for U.S. businesses. Deferral does not provide such protection, but rather treats active overseas income of financial services firms consistently with such income of U.S. industrial firms, and

helps to level the playing field with respect to their foreign competitors. It is my firm belief that foreign tax credits and deferral are independent provisions of our international tax regime, and their co-existence is consistent with sound international tax policy.

Since the bill before us today would be effective for only 1 year, I strongly urge the Treasury to continue to work together with the securities and banking industries to reach a fair and lasting agreement on a permanent solution that can be enacted next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2513. This legislation represents sound policy that will enhance the ability of the financial services industry to compete in the global marketplace.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply ask Members for their support on this bipartisan effort on H.R. 2513.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2513, as amended, and lay on the table H.R. 2444.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, the bill, H.R. 2513, as amended, was passed.

H.R. 2444 was laid on the table.

The title of the bill, H.R. 2513, was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and modify the provision of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to exempting active financing income from foreign personal holding company income and to provide for the nonrecognition of gain on the sale of stock in agricultural processors to certain farmers' cooperatives, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2513.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WAIVING TIME LIMITATION ON AWARDING MEDAL OF HONOR TO ROBERT R. INGRAM

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2813) to waive time limitations specified by law in order to allow the Medal of Honor to be awarded to Robert R. Ingram of Jacksonville, FL, for acts of valor while a Navy Hospital Corpsman in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam conflict.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2813

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO ROBERT R. INGRAM FOR VALOR DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT.

(a) **WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.**—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 6248 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the naval service, the President may award the Medal of Honor under section 6241 of that title to Robert R. Ingram of Jacksonville, Florida, for the acts of valor referred to in subsection (b).

(b) **ACTION DESCRIBED.**—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of Robert R. Ingram on March 28, 1966, as a Hospital Corpsman Third Class in the Navy serving in the Republic of Vietnam with Company C of the First Battalion, Seventh Marines, during a combat operation designated as Operation Indiana.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

□ 1715

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very pleased that the House is today considering H.R. 2813, legislation I have introduced that would waive the statute of limitations to enable the Defense Department to award Mr. Robert R. Ingram of Jacksonville, FL, a Congressional Medal of Honor. I want to thank especially both the chairman and the ranking Democrat of the House Committee on National Security and the staff there who helped expedite committee consideration of this bill and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who has been profoundly interested in this matter and whose assistance was instrumental in helping bring this measure to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was requested by the Defense Department and the award is long overdue. It was not made earlier only as a result of a very unfortunate oversight. In fact, Corpsman Ingram's fighting companions thought that the recommendation for his Congressional Medal of Honor had been made long ago and were shocked to learn only recently that the award had never been made.

Today we must move to correct that error. I want to read to Members the details of what happened that day and why he should be awarded this medal. Corpsman Ingram was serving with Company C, First Battalion, Seventh Marines, against elements of a North Vietnam aggressor in Quang Ngai Province, Republic of Vietnam, on March 28, 1966.

Corpsman Ingram accompanied a Marine point platoon as it dispatched an outpost of an NVA battalion. The momentum of the attack rolled off a ridge line down a tree covered slope to a small paddy in a village beyond. A village tree line suddenly and without any warning exploded in fire against the Marine platoon. There was an intense hail of automatic rifle fire from

approximately 100 North Vietnamese regulars. In mere moments the platoon ranks were decimated. Oblivious to the slaughter and danger around him, Corpsman Ingram crawled through a hail of bullets to reach a downed Marine. As he administered aid, a bullet went through the palm of his hand. Calls for corpsmen continued across the ridge. Bleeding, Corpsman Ingram moved across the battlefield, collecting ammunition from the dead and administering aid to the wounded as he went. Receiving two more wounds, one in the knee and one in his face that he immediately knew was life threatening, he looked for a way off the ridge, but again heard the call for corpsmen. Again he answered, knowing that he was facing sure death. Though severely wounded three times, he gathered magazines, resupplied and encouraged those capable of returning fire, rendered aid to those incapable of movement until he finally reached the right flank of the platoon. While addressing the head wound of another corpsman, he sustained his fourth bullet wound. Even with those wounds for the next 2 to 3 hours, Corpsman Ingram still encouraged and doctored his Marines.

Enduring the pain from his many wounds and disregarding his own life, Corpsman Ingram's intrepid actions saved many that day. By his indomitable fighting spirit, daring initiative and unfaltering dedication to duty, Corpsman Ingram earned the Medal of Honor during that action in Operation Indiana in March 1966. He demonstrated conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty.

I commend him for his enormous courage, and I look forward to passage of this bill so that he can finally receive this Nation's highest award for valor, which he so richly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am very pleased to join with the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] in presenting a much overdue recommendation to this House.

In the Marine Corps we call him Doc. He is the corpsman who administers to our needs both in peace and in war-time. In 2 days, we will celebrate the 222d birthday of the U.S. Marine Corps. I can tell the Speaker that there is no more courageous chapter in Marine Corps history than that which has been written by the corpsmen who have been attached. Whether you are reading the history of Iwo Jima or the battles in Vietnam up through the conflicts that took place in the Persian Gulf 6 years ago, corpsmen are by our sides when we need them.

In this case, I hope all who are present in the Chamber heard the words that were just read by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER]. Doc Ingram was shot 4 times in the service of his country. Over a period of several hours, having received wounds

that were life threatening, under circumstances that were almost impossible to imagine, this brave sailor, wounded 4 times and bleeding, continued to minister to the Marines around him and while he was wrapping a bandage around the head of another corpsman was shot a final time. I cannot imagine valor of that magnitude. 30 years later, we have the opportunity to correct an injustice. That brave young sailor, that friend of Marines, that man who went in harm's way for our Nation and shed his blood in the process is finally being recognized today as a man who earned, is not being given, but earned the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In 2 days, we celebrate that birthday of the Marine Corps. As someone who has been proud to be a marine for 25 years, I am equally proud of the corpsmen who have served so bravely with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who along with the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] directly produced the opportunity that we have today.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this effort. On March 28, 1966, Corpsman Robert Ingram accompanied his Marine platoon as it approached an outpost of the North Vietnamese aggressor. As they approached the tree line, suddenly and without any warning, there was an explosion of gunfire against the platoon. Approximately 100 North Vietnamese were attacking. Disregarding the danger and slaughter around him, Corpsman Ingram crawled through a hail of bullets to reach a downed marine. As he was administering aid, a bullet went through the palm of his hand. While he was treating other downed Marines and collecting magazines to return fire, he received three additional bullet wounds, including one penetrating his sinus cavity. His actions saved many lives that day.

In 1995, former First Lieutenant Jim Fulkerson and others who served together in the war were working to set up a reunion for the platoon. They were shocked to learn in preparing for the reunion that Corpsman Ingram had never received the Medal of Honor. His companions all understood that a recommendation had been made and assumed that it was made. The Department of Defense agrees that Corpsman Ingram's actions qualify him for the Medal of Honor that day in March 1966. Now, over 30 years later, the House of Representatives has the opportunity to see appropriate recognition is given to Corpsman Ingram's display of valor. It is because of the efforts made by his platoon members that this has gotten where it is today. I also commend the gentlewoman from Florida for her work on this important matter. This is a fitting thing that the Congress will do.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Representative of the Florida Third Congressional District, I am so proud today to honor one of Jacksonville's own, Robert Ingram.

This Tuesday is Veterans Day. Our annual celebration of the commitment and sacrifices made by our Nation's veterans. There are more than 26 million veterans today, many of whom served during times of conflict. Many veterans live in my home State of Florida. We are proud to have them there. We are proud of their service and proud of their civic action.

I also want to recognize for Veterans Day the many women veterans who have contributed to our Nation's security and preserved the American way of life. Last month, the Women in Military Service Memorial was dedicated in honor of more than 1 million women who have served this great country. I urge everyone to visit this great special place when they are in Washington.

Our veterans face many challenges. I urge the President to speedily designate and the other body confirm a Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I want to say a special thank you to all veterans, and today I want to honor one in particular. As my colleague from Florida has explained, Mr. Robert Ingram performed incredible acts of courage, honor, and bravery while he was a marine stationed in Vietnam. We ask so much of our young men and women when they are placed into conflict, particularly in conflict that was so unpopular.

Corpsman Ingram gave medical attention to other soldiers, even after he himself was injured with a bullet wound in his hand. He suffered even more wounds to his knees and face, yet continued to help others as they called on him. He continued to administer medical aid to others after receiving a total of 4 bullet wounds.

The Medal of Honor is awarded for bravery and courage, acts beyond the call of duty. Robert Ingram has had an incredible fighting spirit to stay alive, to help his brothers in combat and to serve our great Nation. I am very proud today to honor a man from Jacksonville and the great State of Florida. He deserves this Medal of Honor and should not be a victim of administrative error or oversight. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and salute this great veteran.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. For the past 222 years, the Navy and the Marine Corps have established a partnership forged in steel and tempered in blood. Some 30 years ago, Suicide Charlie, Charlie 17, one of the most distinguished companies in the entire U.S. Marine Corps, faced incredible odds on a battlefield in Vietnam. Doc Ingram stepped forward under fire

when needed by his country. And despite 4 serious life threatening bullet wounds, he continued to care for his fellow marines, his fellow sailors and for his country. Some 30 years later, we correct an injustice. Mr. Speaker, I hope sincerely that Doc Ingram is watching as we speak today. I hope he realizes how much he is beloved by his country.

Doc, if you are watching, happy birthday, and semper fidelis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I too just want to again say how privileged I feel today to be a part of this honoring of Doc Ingram. I know he is in Jacksonville today, watching this on television, and I know he understands with what honor and regard we Members of the Congress hold his actions. We are so pleased that here today we can commend his valor and bravery. This is due to the people he saved, who really came forward and said, this award is long overdue, they were surprised it had not been given. Those men that he saved that day will never forget that their lives were saved because of his actions.

That is what those people in our military do every day of their lives. They are out there sacrificing their lives for others. It is a great day when we can commend one. I want to again say how proud I am to be a part of this.

Thank you, Doc Ingram, for all you have done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2813.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 619]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton

Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono

Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady

Cannon
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney

McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshady
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skeen

Skelton	Stupak	Visclosky
Slaughter	Sununu	Wamp
Smith (MI)	Talent	Waters
Smith (NJ)	Tanner	Watkins
Smith (OR)	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Smith (TX)	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Smith, Adam	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Smith, Linda	Thomas	Weldon (FL)
Snowbarger	Thompson	Weldon (PA)
Snyder	Thornberry	Weller
Solomon	Thune	Wexler
Souder	Thurman	Weygand
Spence	Tiahrt	White
Spratt	Tierney	Whitfield
Stabenow	Torres	Wicker
Stark	Towns	Wise
Stearns	Traficant	Wolf
Stenholm	Turner	Woolsey
Stokes	Upton	Wynn
Strickland	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Stump	Vento	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Blumenauer	Holden	Ros-Lehtinen
Clayton	Klug	Sanders
Cubin	McDermott	Schaffer, Bob
Flake	McIntosh	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	Neumann	Walsh
Gonzalez	Riley	Yates

□ 1750

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, BARTLETT of Maryland and COMBEST and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS RE- PORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-394) on the resolution (H. Res. 314) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—DIS- MISSAL OF CONTEST IN 46TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 315) pursuant to rule IX and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CALVERT]. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas, the election contest concerning the 46th District of California should be dismissed as there is no credible evidence to show that the outcome of the election is different than the election of Congresswomen LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Whereas, State of California authorities should continue their investigation into questionable registration activities; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should examine voter registration procedures; and now therefore be it

Resolved, that the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was told by the majority leader that we would have time to debate this resolution. I was also told by the Speaker that we would have time to debate this resolution.

Am I correct that voting for this motion made by the Chairman of the Committee on Rules will obviate the representations of the Speaker and the majority leader?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not a debatable motion.

The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 193, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 620]

AYES—215

Aderholt	Calvert	Dunn
Archer	Camp	Ehlers
Armey	Campbell	Ehrlich
Bachus	Canady	Emerson
Baker	Cannon	English
Ballenger	Castle	Ensign
Barr	Chabot	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Chambliss	Ewing
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Fawell
Barton	Christensen	Foley
Bass	Coble	Fossella
Bateman	Coburn	Fowler
Bereuter	Collins	Fox
Bilbray	Combust	Franks (NJ)
Bilirakis	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bliley	Cooksey	Gallegly
Blunt	Cox	Ganske
Boehlert	Crane	Gekas
Boehner	Crapo	Gibbons
Bonilla	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Bono	Davis (VA)	Gilman
Brady	Deal	Gingrich
Bryant	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bunning	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Burr	Dickey	Graham
Burton	Doolittle	Granger
Buyer	Dreier	Greenwood
Callahan	Duncan	Gutknecht

Hansen	McCrery	Saxton
Hastert	McDade	Scarborough
Hastings (WA)	McHugh	Schaefer, Dan
Hayworth	McInnis	Schaffer, Bob
Hefley	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Herger	Metcalfe	Sessions
Hill	Mica	Shadegg
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Shays
Hoekstra	Morella	Shimkus
Horn	Nethercutt	Shuster
Hostettler	Ney	Skeen
Houghton	Northup	Smith (MI)
Hulshof	Norwood	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Nussle	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Packard	Smith, Linda
Inglis	Pappas	Snowbarger
Istook	Parker	Solomon
Jenkins	Paul	Souder
Johnson (CT)	Paxon	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Pease	Stearns
Jones	Peterson (PA)	Stump
Kasich	Petri	Sununu
Kelly	Pickering	Talent
Kim	Pitts	Tauzin
King (NY)	Pombo	Thomas
Kingston	Porter	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Portman	Thune
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Tiahrt
LaHood	Quinn	Traficant
Largent	Radanovich	Upton
Latham	Ramstad	Watkins
LaTourette	Redmond	Watts (OK)
Lazio	Regula	Weldon (FL)
Leach	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Rogan	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	White
Linder	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Livingston	Roukema	Wicker
LoBiondo	Royce	Wolf
Lucas	Ryun	Young (AK)
Manzullo	Salmon	Young (FL)
McCollum	Sanford	

NOES—193

Abercrombie	Fattah	Markey
Ackerman	Fazio	Martinez
Allen	Filner	Mascara
Andrews	Foglietta	Matsui
Baesler	Forbes	McCarthy (MO)
Baldacci	Ford	McCarthy (NY)
Barcia	Frost	McGovern
Barrett (WI)	Furse	McHale
Becerra	Gejdenson	McIntyre
Bentsen	Gephardt	McKinney
Berman	Goode	McNulty
Berry	Gordon	Meehan
Bishop	Green	Meek
Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Menendez
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Millender-
Boswell	Hall (TX)	McDonald
Boucher	Hamilton	Miller (CA)
Boyd	Harman	Minge
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Moakley
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Mollohan
Cardin	Hinchey	Moran (VA)
Carson	Hinojosa	Murtha
Clay	Hoolley	Nadler
Clement	Hoyer	Neal
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Condit	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Conyers	(TX)	Olver
Costello	Jefferson	Ortiz
Coyne	John	Owens
Cramer	Johnson (WI)	Pallone
Cummins	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Danner	Kanjorski	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
DeGette	Kennelly	Pickett
Delahunt	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Poshard
Dellums	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Deutscher	Klecza	Rahall
Dicks	Klink	Rangel
Dingell	Kucinich	Reyes
Dixon	LaFalce	Rivers
Doggett	Lampson	Rodriguez
Dooley	Levin	Roemer
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Edwards	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lofgren	Rush
Eshoo	Lowe	Sabo
Etheridge	Luther	Sandlin
Evans	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Farr	Maloney (NY)	Schumer

Scott	Stenholm	Turner
Serrano	Stokes	Velazquez
Sherman	Strickland	Vento
Sisisky	Stupak	Visclosky
Skaggs	Tanner	Waters
Skelton	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Smith, Adam	Thompson	Wexler
Snyder	Thurman	Weygand
Spratt	Tierney	Wise
Stabenow	Torres	Woolsey
Stark	Towns	Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Sanchez	Wamp
---------	------

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer	Goodling	Neumann
Borski	Holden	Riley
Clayton	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Lantos	Sanders
Flake	Manton	Schiff
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	McIntosh	Walsh
Gonzalez	Myrick	Yates

□ 1813

Mr. CRAPO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have in my left hand a document which is the bill we will be voting on tomorrow. It is called the reciprocal trade agreement, not unlike the reciprocal trade agreement in the early 1930's. The only problem is that our trade policies have not been reciprocal in particularly the last 3 years.

NAFTA has caused job losses in the hundreds of thousands for the last 34 months. In our area in north Jersey, approximately 15,000 jobs have been lost since NAFTA's inception. And in Mexico and Canada, it is graphic evidence that NAFTA is not working over the long haul. We have tripled, we have quadrupled the imbalance in trade with Mexico, 2½ times the imbalance in trade with Canada. This is not a record of accomplishment but rather of failure. Please vote "no" on fast track.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss a matter of great importance to my district and to the Nation as a whole—the issue of the renewal of fast-track trade negotiating authority.

As the debate moves to a close, and as supporters and detractors of the measure voice their positions, I rise today for the purpose of clarification. And to share the conclusions that I have come to regarding this important issue.

The measure seeks to extend fast-track authority for 4 years. As such, it sets our national trade policy as we approach—and then enter—the 21st century.

No one doubts the fact that we live in a global economy—and that nation's are more interconnected than ever before. No one doubts that if we are to retain our preeminent position in the world—we must lead from strength—both economically and morally.

And for me, global leadership in the arena of international trade means that fair trade should not be subordinated to the notion of free trade.

We must trade with other nations on equal footing—and not sacrifice American jobs to those earning a lower wage—particularly when that nation has not yet achieved our level of social, economic, and environmental development.

The bill that I am holding—the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997—commonly referred to as fast track—states very clearly its objectives and scope.

Section 102(b)(7)(B) of the bill states that:

The principle negotiating objectives of the United States is to ensure that foreign governments do not derogate from or waive existing domestic environmental, health, safety, or labor measures . . . as an encouragement to gain competitive advantage in international trade.

The key word in this section is "existing." No country that fast track is designed to facilitate trade with, has adequate existing environmental and labor structures. Nothing in the legislation before us enables the United States to negotiate for higher standards. That is unacceptable and workers, business owners, and consumers in the United States have paid the price for this disparity in standards.

And, just as importantly, the fast-track authority that past Presidents have had—including President's Bush and Reagan—allowed them to negotiate weak side agreements for labor and the environment; this measure does not even allow that.

Basically, we are throwing up our hands and saying let those with whom we trade improve on their own—and in their own time.

We are saying: Let them pay their workers a bowl of rice a day, let them not give their workers the right to organize, let their factories dump sewage into the rivers, let them pollute the air, let them ship tainted food across our borders to be consumed at dinner tables across the country, and on and on and on.

And make no mistake about it—this debate is not about labor versus business or Republican versus Democrat—this debate is about jobs. Its about the environment and environmental degradation. Its about consumer safety in areas like imported food. Its about the viability of small businesses who struggle to be competitive. And finally its about consumers who today are paying more now than ever before for imported apparel at the clothing store.

The proponents of fast track argue that the administration deserves this ability based on what they perceive as a successful NAFTA policy. They point to the creation of 311,000 new jobs.

I take exception to this figure and cite an alternative one from the Economic Policy Institute which states that 600,000 jobs have been lost during NAFTA's first 34 months.

In northern New Jersey alone, statistics show that approximately 15,000 jobs have been lost since 1993. Many companies in my district specifically point to NAFTA as the proximate cause of their reduction in business. In fact, the small businesses who have contacted me have had to cut jobs—and have not created a single new one since 1993.

Trade policy needs to be inclusive regarding these important elements, not exclusive. Labor and environmental provisions need to be in the core agreement. If we do not lead from the

high ground we will relinquish all that we have accomplished in our long progress to achieving the society that we now live in.

The argument that this fast-track legislation represents forward progress rings hollow to my ears and to many of my colleagues. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this flawed measure.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 170. An act to provide for a process to authorize the use of clone pagers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1079. An act to permit the mineral leasing of Indian land located within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in any case in which there is consent from a majority interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1455. An act to provide financial assistance for the relocation and expansion of Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology, Providence, Rhode Island; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1456. An act to authorize an interpretive center at Fort Peek Dam, Montana; to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2264. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 858. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 170, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 621]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie Deal
Aderholt DeLay
Archer Diaz-Balart
Armev Dickey
Bachus Doolittle
Baker Dreier
Ballenger Duncan
Barr Dunn
Barrett (NE) Ehlers
Barrett (WI) Ehrlich
Bartlett Emerson
Barton English
Bass Ensign
Bateman Everrett
Bereuter Ewing
Berman Fawell
Billrakis Foley
Bliley Forbes
Blunt Fossella
Boehlert Fowler
Boehner Fox
Bonilla Franks (NJ)
Bono Frelinghuysen
Boucher Gallegly
Brady Gekas
Bryant Gibbons
Bunning Gilchrest
Burr Gilman
Burton Goodlatte
Buyer Goodling
Callahan Goss
Calvert Graham
Camp Granger
Campbell Greenwood
Canady Gutknecht
Cannon Hall (OH)
Castle Hamilton
Chabot Hansen
Chambliss Hastert
Chenoweth Hastings (WA)
Christensen Hayworth
Coble Hefley
Coburn Herger
Collins Hill
Combest Hilleary
Conyers Hinchey
Cook Hobson
Cooksey Hoekstra
Cox Horn
Crane Hostettler
Crapo Houghton
Cunningham Hulshof
Davis (FL) Hunter
Davis (VA) Hutchinson

Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker

Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema

Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shinkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns

Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone

Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam

Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NAYS—170

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Billbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bonior
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)

DeFazio
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green

Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Engel
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther

Blumenauer
Borski
Holden
Clayton
Cubin
Flake
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gutierrez

NOT VOTING—30

Harman
Holden
Klecicka
Klug
Manton
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Riley
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanders
Schiff
Klug
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Waxman
Yates

□ 1831

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) Under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, November 9, 1997, at 2 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the 4th quarter of 1996, and the 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarters of 1997, by various committees, U.S. House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official foreign travel in the 3rd quarter of 1997, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Korea and Japan, December 13-19, 1996:											
Delegation expenses	12/16	12/19	Japan						455.07		455.07
Committee total									455.07		455.07

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1997.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Ralph Regula	3/26	3/28	Estonia	857.00	(3)	857.00
	3/28	3/29	Latvia ⁴	(3)		
	3/29	3/30	Krakow, Poland	346.00	(3)	346.00	
	3/30	4/2	Warsaw, Poland	526.00	(3)	526.00	
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic	524.00	(3)	524.00	
Committee total					\$2,253.00						\$2,253.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ No per diem.

BOB LIVINGSTON, Chairman, Oct. 29, 1997.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date			Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure	Foreign cur- rency		U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	
Hon. Mark Foley	6/13	6/16	Haiti	³ 651.60	542.45	³ 1,194.05
Sean Peterson	9/21	9/25	Hong Kong	607.08	4,372.45	4,979.53
Committee total	1,258.68	4,914.90	6,173.58

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Amended.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, Oct. 29, 1997.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date			Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure			Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Visit to Japan, Korea, and Thailand, Jan. 13–20, 1997:												
Delegation expenses	1/13	1/15	Japan	890.92	1,806.29	2,697.21
	1/17	1/20	Thailand	3,298.34	3,298.34
Committee total	890.92	5,104.63	5,995.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1997.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Deborah Pryce	2/17	2/18	Italy	242.00	(3)	242.00
	2/18	2/20	Germany	546.00	(3)	546.00
Committee total	788.00	788.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

J. Moakley, Oct. 25, 1997

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gerald Solomon	3/26	3/28	Estonia	857.00	(3)	857.00
	3/28	3/29	Latvia ⁴
	3/29	3/30	Krakow, Poland	346.00	(3)	346.00
	3/30	4/2	Warsaw, Poland	526.00	(3)	526.00
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic	524.00	(3)	524.00
Hon. Porter Goss	3/26	3/28	Estonia	857.00	(3)	857.00
	3/28	3/29	Latvia ⁴
	3/29	3/30	Krakow, Poland	346.00	(3)	346.00
	3/30	4/2	Warsaw, Poland	526.00	(3)	526.00
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic	524.00	(3)	524.00
Codel Solomon	3/26	3/28	Estonia	1,777.32	1,777.32
	3/28	3/29	Latvia ⁴	2,689.46	2,689.46
	3/29	3/30	Krakow, Poland	1,622.41	1,622.41
	3/30	4/2	Warsaw, Poland	2,940.93	2,940.93
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic	1,528.00	1,528.00
Jim Doron	3/26	3/28	Estonia	857.00	(3)	857.00
	3/28	3/29	Latvia ⁴	(3)

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	3/29	3/30	Krakow, Poland		346.00		(³)				346.00
	3/30	4/2	Warsaw, Poland		526.00		(³)				526.00
	4/2	4/4	Czech Republic		524.00		(³)				524.00
Committee total					6,759.00				10,558.12		17,317.12

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ No per diem.

J. MOAKLEY, Oct. 25, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Paul Unger	8/17	8/29	France		644.17		560.51				1,204.68
Committee total					644.17		560.51				1,204.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 29, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Sue Sheridan	8/3	8/8	Germany		1,122.00		1,028.95				2,150.95
Dennis Fitzgibbons	8/3	8/9	Germany		1,122.00		1,062.65				2,184.65
Catherine Van Way	7/31	8/10	Germany		1,683.00		1,062.65				2,745.65
Dennis Fitzgibbons	8/16	8/25	Australia		430.00		6,806.45				7,106.45
Hon. Eliot Engel	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00		(³)				532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00		(³)				753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00		(³)				217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00		(³)				1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00		(³)				251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Committee total					8,479.00		9,960.70				18,439.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ Private travel from Aug. 22–25, 1997.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Oct. 27, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Italy, Bosnia, and Hungary, June 28–July 2, 1998:											
Hon. Paul McHale	6/28	6/29	Italy		75.00						75.00
	6/29	6/29	Bosnia								
	6/29	7/01	Hungary		494.00						494.00
	7/01	7/02	Italy		284.00						284.00
Commercial airfare							4,271.45				4,271.45
Visit to Korea and Vietnam, Aug. 12–18, 1997:											
Hon. Lane Evans	8/12	8/12	Korea								
	8/12	8/18	Vietnam		1,470.00						1,470.00
Commercial airfare							5,101.30				5,101.30
Hon. Paul McHale	8/12	8/12	Korea								
	8/12	8/18	Vietnam		1,764.00						1,764.00
Commercial airfare							5,101.30				5,101.30
George O. Withers	8/12	8/12	Korea								
	8/12	8/18	Vietnam		1,764.00						1,764.00
Commercial airfare							5,101.30				5,101.30
Visit to Thailand, Vietnam, and Australia, Aug. 18–29, 1997:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Hon. Tillie Fowler	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Hon. Howard “Buck” McKeon	8/18	8/21	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Commercial airfare							784.00				784.00
Hon. Lindsey Graham	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Dr. Andrew K. Ellis	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
	8/18	8/21	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	8/21	8/23	Vietnam		588.00						588.00
	8/23	8/29	Australia		1,556.00						1,556.00
Delegation expenses	8/23	8/29	Australia				3,834.00		2,432.00		6,266.00
Visit to Argentina and Brazil, Aug. 17–18, 1997: Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	8/17	8/17	Argentina								
	8/18	8/18	Brazil								
Visit to United Kingdom, Hungary, Italy, and Ger- many, Aug. 24–Sept. 2, 1997: Hon Ike Skelton	8/24	8/29	United Kingdom		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/27	8/29	Hungary		494.00						494.00
	8/29	8/31	Italy		445.00						445.00
	8/31	9/2	Germany		285.00						285.00
Commercial airfare							3,261.35				3,261.35
Visit to Panama, Aug. 25–27, 1997: Hon. Jim Gibbons	8/25	8/27	Panama		155.60						155.60
Visit to South Africa, Sept. 19–22, 1997: Hon. Curt Weldon	9/19	9/22	South Africa		700.00						700.00
Commercial airfare							6,272.65				6,272.65
Committee total					28,099.60		33,727.35		2,432.00		64,258.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Donna Christian-Green	6/29	7/2	Haiti		669.00						669.00
	9/5	9/8	Haiti		669.00						669.00
Committee total					1,338.00						1,338.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Oct. 27, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Louise Slaughter	8/17	8/19	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/22	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/25	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Tony Hall	8/29	9/1	Korea		1,085.00		(3)				1,085.00
	9/2	9/3	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Committee total					4,020.00						4,020.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

J. MOAKLEY, Oct. 25, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1
AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Bob Borski	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Bill Lipinski	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Bob Clement	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Bud Cramer	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Pat Danner	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Tim Holden	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Steve LaTourette	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1
AND SEPT. 30, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Juanita Millender-McDonald	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
Jim Miller	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Mary Moll	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
David Schaffer	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Mary Walsh	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Dianne Rogers	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Jennifer Laptook	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Colleen Corr	8/18	8/20	England		886.00		(3)				886.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. John Duncan	8/18	8/20	England		692.00		(3)				692.00
	8/20	8/23	France		882.00		(3)				882.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Commercial airfare							1,300.00				1,300.00
Jim Coon	8/19	8/20	England		692.00		(3)				692.00
	8/20	8/23	France		588.00		(3)				588.00
Commercial airfare							2,563.15				2,563.15
Hon. Steve Horn	8/22	8/23	France		294.00		(3)				294.00
	8/23	8/26	Spain		828.00		(3)				828.00
Hon. Bob Filner	8/18	8/19	Mexico		243.00						243.00
Commercial airfare							635.17				635.17
Committee total					46,583		4,498.32				51,081.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BUD SHUSTER, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Mac Collins	8/9	8/11	Turkey		774.00		(3)				774.00
	8/12	8/14	Georgia		1,152.00		(3)				1,152.00
Committee total					1,926.00						1,926.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, Oct. 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HONG KONG, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 28 AND JULY 2, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Christopher Cox	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
Hon. John Porter	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
Hon. Marcy Kaptur	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
Hon. Thomas J. Manton	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
Hon. Jim McDermott	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	22,747	32,939.00					22,747	2,939.00
C. Dean McGrath	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	20,919	2,703.00					20,919	2,703.00
Michael Wessel	6/28	7/2	Hong Kong	20,919	2,703.00					20,919	2,703.00
Committee total					23,040.00						23,040.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Includes pre-paid hotel costs at U.S. \$560 per day.

CHRIS COX, August 1, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO SUMMIT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 6 AND JULY 9, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	7/6	7/7	Czech Republic		300.00						300.00
	7/7	7/9	Spain		284.00						284.00
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	7/6	7/7	Czech Republic		300.00						300.00
	7/7	7/9	Spain		284.00						284.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	7/7	7/9	Spain		284.00						284.00
Hon. Norman Sisisky	7/7	7/9	Spain		284.00						284.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO SUMMIT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 6 AND JULY 9, 1997—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Stephen Rademaker	7/7	7/9	Spain		284.00						284.00
Hon. Brett O'Brien	7/7		Spain		284.00						284.00
Committee total					2,304.00						2,304.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Sept. 17, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CHILE, ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 12 AND AUG. 20, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Richard A. Gephardt	8/13	8/15	Chile		288.00		³ 3,532.95				3,820.95
	8/15	8/17	Argentina		546.00		⁴ 1,113.10		4760.93		2,420.03
	8/17	8/19	Brazil	624.25	575.88					624.25	575.88
Michael Wessel	8/13	8/15	Chile		534.00		³ 3,532.95				4,066.95
	8/15	8/17	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	8/17	8/19	Brazil	601.46	554.85					601.46	554.85
Committee total					3,044.73		8,179.00		760.93		11,984.66

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Includes commercial airfare transportation costs for entire trip.
⁴ These expenditures were made on behalf of the entire delegation.

Sept. 18, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NEPAL AND CHINA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 6 AND AUG. 15, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Frank R. Wolf		8/16	United States				6,509.95				6,509.95
	8/8	8/9	Nepal		¹ 1,050.00						1,050.00
	8/9	8/13	China				380.00		235.00		615.00
Charles E. White	8/15		United States								
		8/16	United States				6,509.95				6,509.95
	8/8	8/9	Nepal		1,050.00						1,050.00
	8/14		United States								
	8/9	8/13	China				380.00		235.00		615.00
Committee total					2,100.00		13,779.90		470.00		16,349.90

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Airline ticket prices for return flights are under review. Any savings resulting from a reduction in airfare will be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

FRANK R. WOLF, Sept. 15, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 21 AND AUG. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²	Foreign cur- rency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. cur- rency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. William Jefferson	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Scott Klug	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Everett Eissenstat	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Ron Lasch	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Meredith Broadbent	8/21	8/23	Ivory Coast		424.00		(³)				424.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. William Jefferson	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Scott Klug	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Everett Eissenstat	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Ron Lasch	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Meredith Broadbent	8/23	8/25	South Africa		512.00		(³)				512.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. William Jefferson	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Scott Klug	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Everett Eissenstat	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Ron Lasch	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Meredith Broadbent	8/25	8/26	South Africa		207.00		(³)				207.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		468.00		(³)				468.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 21 AND AUG. 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bernard Sanders	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. William Jefferson	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. Scott Klug	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. Jim Greenwood	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. Melvin Watt	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Hon. Karen Thurman	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Everett Eissenstat	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Ron Lasch	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Meredith Broadbent	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe	468.00	(³)	468.00
Committee total	17,721.00	17,721.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Sept. 29, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORWAY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 8, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jack Quinn	9/6	9/8	Norway	224.00	1,497.65	1,721.65
Dan Skopec	9/6	9/8	Norway	224.00	1,497.65	1,721.65
Committee total	448.00	2,995.30	3,443.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK QUINN.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 12 AND SEPT. 15, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Christopher Cox	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Hon. Jon D. Fox	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Hon. Sue Myrick	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Hon. Michael R. McNulty	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Hon. Frank Pallone	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Hon. Sherrod Brown	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
C. Dean McGrath	9/12	9/15	India	575.00	575.00
Committee total	4,025.00	4,025.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS COX, Oct. 8, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 29 AND JULY 2, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Carl LeVan	6/29	7/2	Haiti	1,705.00	101.00	1,705	101.00
.....	250.00	250.00
Committee total	351.00	351.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

O. CARL LeVAN, Jr., Aug. 1, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO IRELAND AND NORTHERN IRELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 2 AND AUG. 7, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mary McD. Noonan	8/2	8/3	Ireland	143.73	209.00	209.00
.....	8/3	8/5	Northern Ireland	476.00	476.00
.....	8/5	8/7	Ireland	287.46	418.00	418.00
Commercial airfare	4,273.95	4,273.95
Committee total	1,103.00	4,273.95	5,376.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARY McD. NOONAN, Sept. 5, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO TAIWAN, CHINA, THAILAND, INDIA, JORDAN AND ISRAEL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 8 AND AUG. 22, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Chaplain James Ford	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		532.00						532.00
	8/10	8/13	China		753.00						753.00
	8/13	8/14	Thailand		217.00						217.00
	8/14	8/18	India		1,424.00						1,424.00
	8/18	8/19	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	8/19	8/22	Israel		1,075.00						1,075.00
Committee total					4,252.00						4,252.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES D. FORD, Sept. 9, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO GERMANY, AUSTRIA, BOSNIA, FRANCE AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 30 AND SEPT. 11, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Gardner G. Peckham	9/1	9/1	Germany		200.00						200.00
	9/1	9/2	Austria	2,814.32	221.00						221.00
	9/2	9/7	Bosnia		1,755.00						1,755.00
	9/7	9/9	France	3,432.80	560.00						560.00
	9/9	9/11	United Kingdom	436.30	692.00						692.00
Commercial airfare	8/30	9/1					2,322.05				2,322.05
					3 — 475.00						— 475.00
Committee total					2,953.00		2,322.05				5,275.05

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Excess per diem, returned to U.S. Treasury.

GARDNER G. PECKHAM, Sept. 29, 1997.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SAXTON: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 1997 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 105-393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 314. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of clause of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-394). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1544. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from pursuing policies of unjustifiable non-acquiescence in, and relitigation of, precedents established in the Federal judicial circuits; with an amendment (Rept. 105-395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 96. Resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact (Rept. 105-396). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1625. A bill to ensure that workers have sufficient information about their rights regarding the payment of dues or fees to labor organizations and the uses of employee dues and fees by labor organizations; with an amendment (Rept. 105-397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2259. A bill to provide for a transfer of land interests in order to facilitate surface transportation between the cities of Cold Bay, AK, and King Cove, AK,

and for other purposes (Rept. 105-398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the exemption from income tax for social clubs found to be practicing prohibited discrimination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 2929. A bill to reform Social Security by creating individual Social Security retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. HORN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROGAN, Ms. DANNER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MCCRERY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr.

BLUMENAUER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. RYUN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YATES, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SABO, Mr. COOK, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. STENHOLM);

H.R. 2930. A bill to impose certain sanctions on foreign persons who transfer items contributing to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2931. A bill to redesignate the naval facility located in Gricignano d'Aversa, Italy, and known as the Naples Support Site, as the "Thomas M. Foglietta Support Site"; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BORSKI:

H.R. 2932. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration program to determine the effectiveness of establishing fair market rentals, for purposes of the tenant-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, by smaller geographic areas; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce employer and employee Social Security taxes to the extent there is a Federal budget surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2934. A bill to repeal the Bennett Freeze thus ending a gross treaty violation with the Navajo Nation and allowing the Navajo Nation citizens to live in habitable dwellings and raise their living conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 2935. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to ensure that States have in effect a law that requires a background check to be conducted in connection with the purchase of a handgun from a licensed firearms dealer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Ms. DANNER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COBLE, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 2936. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain requirements relating to the unloading of cargo tank vehicles in liquefied compressed gas service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 2937. A bill to provide for the recognition of digital and other forms of authentication as an alternative to existing paperbased methods, to improve efficiency and soundness of the Nation's capital markets and the payment system, and to define and harmonize the practices, customs, and uses applicable to the conduct of electronic authentication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, the Judiciary, Science, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2938. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from treating any medicaid-related funds recovered as part of State litigation from one or more tobacco

companies as an overpayment under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HILL, Mr. GOODE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SALMON, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BOB SCHAFER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COOK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COCKSEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 2939. A bill to provide for the periodic review of the efficiency and public need for Federal agencies, to establish a Commission for the purpose of reviewing the efficiency and public need of such agencies, and to provide for the abolishment of agencies for which a public need does not exist; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 2940. A bill to enhance competition and consumer choice in the delivery of financial products and services; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 2941. A bill to permit States to condition use of State funds for purchase of prescription drugs for minors under certain Federal State matching programs upon parental consent; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit an individual to operate a commercial motor vehicle solely within the borders of a State if the individual has passed written and driving tests to operate the vehicle that meet such minimum standards as may be prescribed by the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the amount of leave time available to a Federal employee in any year in connection with serving as an organ donor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 2944. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies, subject to a reduction of a 50 percent if the recipient dies during the first 15 days of such month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of establishing a Community Recreation and Conservation Endowment with certain escrowed oil and gas revenues, to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. LAZIO of New York):

H.R. 2946. A bill to provide veterans benefits to individuals who serve in the U.S. merchant marine during a period of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2947. A bill to encourage and to assist in the permanent settlement of all litigation and other claims to the waters of the Walker River Basin, NV, and to conserve and stabilize the water quantity and quality for fish habitat and recreation in the Walker River Basin, consistent with the Walker River Decree issued by the U.S. district court for the District of Nevada; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2948. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 2949. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a project to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2950. A bill to prohibit United States assistance to the Republic of Panama if a defense sit or military installation built or formerly operated by the United States has been conveyed by the Government of the Republic of Panama to any foreign government-owned entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, National Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 2956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts received as scholarships by an individual under the National Health Service Corps Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a national program to reduce the threat to human health posed by exposure to contaminants in the air indoors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2953. A bill to require criminal and abusive work history background checks for nurse and home health aides in nursing facilities, home health agencies, and hospice programs under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2954. A bill to establish minimum standards of fair conduct in franchise sales and franchise business relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUTHER:

H.R. 2956. A bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 2957. A bill to provide for development and implementation of certain plans to reduce risks to the public health and welfare caused by helicopter operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCHALE:

H.R. 2958. A bill to reauthorize the Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2959. A bill to provide a civil claim for individuals who are victims of crimes motivated by actual or perceived race, color, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or physical or mental disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the preemption of State law by such title with respect to causes of action for damages for personal or financial injury or wrongful death resulting from failures to provide benefits under employee welfare benefit plans providing health care benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OLVER:

H.R. 2961. A bill to permit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to enter into cooperative research and development agreements for environmental protection; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a wrap-around payment under the Medicare Program for community health center services to account for reductions in payments attributable to individuals covered under managed care plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2963. A bill to establish a youth mentoring program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 2964. A bill to provide for reviews of criminal records of applicants for participation in shared housing arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDLIN:

H.R. 2965. A bill to reduce the amount of the annual contribution of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security investment program; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for employment taxes paid by employees and self-employed individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2967. A bill to amend the title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and other laws to assure the rights of enrollees under managed care plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 2968. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take no further action on proposed regulation relating to the use of chlorofluorocarbons in metered-dose inhalers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 2969. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize States to use community development block grant amounts provided for non-entitlement areas to offset the costs of State charity tax credits; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act for purposes of establishing a national historic lighthouse preservation program; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 2971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a flat tax only on the earned income of individuals and on business taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2972. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a

continuous quality improvement program for providers that furnish services under the Medicare Program to individuals with end stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JOHN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CASTLE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2973. A bill to amend the act popularly known as the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, authorizing assistance to the States for fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2974. A bill to authorize certain military construction projects for fiscal year 1999 for the 910th Airlift Wing at Youngstown, OH; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2975. A bill to establish the Federal Housing Corporation to provide mortgage credit to families, communities, and markets underserved by the conventional mortgage markets and ensure the stability of the national system for mortgage finance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to certain specified bills of the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the congressional Christmas celebration; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in the United States, and supporting political and civic participation by these persons throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Res. 313. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Government procurement access for women-owned businesses; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 315. Resolution relating to a question of the privileges of the House; considered and laid on the table.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H. Res. 316. Resolution recognizing and honoring former South Vietnamese commandos for their heroism, sacrifice, and service during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. ROTHMAN introduced a bill (H.R. 2976) for the relief of Alexandre Malofienko, Olga Matsko, and their son, Vladimir Malofienko; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 68: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 104: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 107: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 135: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 164: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 306: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 519: Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 611: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 725: Mr. FAZIO of California.
H.R. 806: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 902: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SALMON, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1023: Mr. HOUGHTON.
H.R. 1038: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1043: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1054: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1070: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1126: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1165: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1241: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1319: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1322: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 1354: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1362: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1375: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1382: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1453: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1521: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1614: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1625: Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1631: Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 1689: Mr. SALMON and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1891: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1995: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HEF-

NER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 2023: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2029: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 2139: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2183: Mr. EWING.
H.R. 2186: Mr. HANSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2202: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2275: Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2305: Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 2348: Mr. STARK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. KIM, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BONO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HORM, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2349: Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2356: Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 2370: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 2391: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2396: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2456: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 2483: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 2490: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 2492: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2497: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 2499: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2503: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2515: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 2527: Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2579: Mr. UPTON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SNOWBARGER, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 2590: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2593: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2596: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MINGE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2598: Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 2625: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2631: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2667: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2783: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2791: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2796: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 2802: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2820: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2821: Mr. EWING.
H.R. 2829: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 2849: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 2850: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2854: Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2864: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2869: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2870: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 2871: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2873: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2875: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2877: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2879: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2881: Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 2909: Ms. FURSE and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2912: Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2920: Mr. HOUGHTON.
H.R. 2925: Mr. CONYERS.
H.J. Res. 71: Mr. PACKARD.
H. Con. Res. 125: Ms. FURSE.
H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Con. Res. 174: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 183: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H. Res. 171: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 267: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 268: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 281: Mr. FAWELL and Mr. PORTER.
H. Res. 310: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 600: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1366: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.